



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 152

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 7, 2006

No. 109

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Reverend William A. Watson, Jr., Pastor, St. John's Baptist Church, Westbury, New York, offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our Lord, how excellent is Thy name in all the Earth. I thank You for this privilege to pray. Thank You for this occasion that brought us together. Thank You for all of Your loving kindness and tender mercy toward us. I ask Your favor in all our decisions.

Please, Lord, be with us as we make decisions for our future. Grant us clear minds as we serve Your people to the best of our abilities.

Thank You for all these favors, and we will be mindful that all glory and honor belong to You. This is Your servant's prayer. In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. MCCARTHY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING REVEREND WILLIAM A. WATSON, JR.

(Mrs. MCCARTHY asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank my friend, the Reverend William A. Watson of St. John's Baptist Church in Westbury, New York, for offering the opening prayer before the House this morning.

He is someone who is truly worthy of this honor. Reverend Watson is also the head of the Eastern Baptist Association. He is not only a leader in his congregation but an asset to all of Long Island and the entire New York region.

Whether it is keeping young people from joining gangs, helping people gain job skills or improving access to health care, Reverend Watson is a tireless advocate for those in need. Mr. Speaker, I salute Reverend Watson for his great work.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain five 1-minute speeches on each side.

"HEIGH-HO SILVER"—AND THE BORDER

(Mr. POE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, Congress is back in session, and our first major piece of legislation, to protect horses. You see, three or four places in America buy old horses and sell the meat to the French, for goodness sake, so we are going to protect American horses.

So we are going to protect American horses, the likes of Silver, Trigger and Buttercup, from the carnivorous French. This horse security bill will even provide a sanctuary or rest home for those old horses. Well, this Congress needs to be as concerned about border security as we are about horse security.

We need a border security bill with no add-ons that even the Senate will approve. Deal with border security before we talk about the contentious issues of immigration and illegals in this country. Why are we putting horse security at the forefront and not border security?

The American public expects and deserves better. Protecting America's borders should be our first priority. That needs to be our first duty. Stop the invasion at the border, then we can worry about the Europeans eating our horses, otherwise our country will ride off like the Lone Ranger and a "Heigh-Ho Silver" into the sunset of history.

And that's just the way it is.

FIVE YEARS LATE

(Mr. BLUMENAUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, after 5 years the President who ignored the memo that bin Laden wanted to attack the United States is belatedly taking steps to bring to trial suspected terrorists. Why the sudden change of heart? Well, the public is fed up with the bungling, the secret prisons and torture. The Supreme Court has ruled that the administration's approach was unconstitutional. All of this has created a political tide that has forced the President's hand.

But now is the time for the Congress, which has been asleep at the switch allowing the administration's despicable excesses, to do its job. Instead of rubber stamping the administration's flawed and belated proposal, Congress should do what it should have done in the first place: Ensure that justice is done, the enemies of the United States are punished, and America's tarnished image of justice is restored.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H6305

A LETTER FROM IRAQ

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, from a second lieutenant platoon leader in Iraq: "If you watch the news, you know that the greater Baghdad area is in turmoil. We are on the outskirts of the city, controlling the rural area between Baghdad, Ramadi and Fallujah. We believe the area became hostile when terrorist cells fled here during the coalition invasion of the urban areas.

"Now our task is to control this area and give the enemy no safe haven. We are spread thin, but we are getting the job down. The television highlights every explosion and loss of life. But you miss what we do. You miss my soldiers giving water and food to local nationals. You miss my soldiers giving the little kids high-fives and soccer balls. You miss my soldiers replacing sewer systems and rebuilding roads. You miss my medic treating the locals for injuries.

"The news shows death, murder and violence, but daily I see smiles, hard work and hope. Is the area in turmoil? Yes. Is it lost? No, and every day American soldiers bring hope to these people. You won't see it in the morning paper or the evening news, but I am telling you it is here. I know it. I am seeing it, and I am doing it.

"I miss everyone and look forward to coming home. Know that your Army is making you proud to be an American. God bless America."

However, we spend our new found time planning and running missions into unoccupied territory, looking to bring the fight to an enemy who likes to stay hidden. I like the new tempo, because its aggressive and suits the guy's personality much more than a defensive campaign. I am positive that my guys would choose to air assault onto a hostile objective before they would want to defend a quiet base. They are good at their jobs, and love being challenged under pressure.

STUDENT ASSISTANCE

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to follow my Texas colleague, in fact my neighbor in the Houston area, and say the House is spending more time today on this horse bill than we are on homeland security, and we need to deal with that. We need to protect our borders, ports and airports.

If you don't like the bill, I am a co-sponsor of it, you can just vote "nay."

Mr. Speaker, the reason I am here today is because I recently learned that the U.S. Department of Education failed to award the LULAC National Education Service Centers a grant under the Talent Search Program.

The LULAC Talent Search program has been one of the largest talent search grantees since it was first awarded in 1979. This program serves over 12,000 students in some of the country's most disadvantaged areas. These cuts will severely impact the Hispanic community that I represent.

In my Houston area, the local LULAC Council 402 has been an integral part of serving students in our area for years. Just last year, LULAC Council 402 served students in our area and they raised \$32,000 separately to match the Federal funds. This program nationwide serves thousands and serves our Nation, and now the Department of Education has decided to turn out the lights on these centers. I hope someone in the Department of Education is listening.

SECRETARY RUMSFELD SERVES NATION WITH DIGNITY AND HONOR

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong objection to the blatant partisan move of the Senate Democrats and their partisan agenda to force a vote of no confidence in Donald Rumsfeld. It is transparent that the Democrats are making this a political issue and hope to polarize the American people and their views on the war on terror. They are attempting to overshadow and downplay our successes in Iraq and the Republican agenda for winning the war on terror.

A difference of opinion should not equal a vote of no confidence. In our democracy, there will always be room for debate and disagreement, but political posturing and defamation of character have no place in a civilized debate.

Secretary Rumsfeld has worked tirelessly with Iraqi government officials and its military to bring freedom and democracy to a formerly tyrannical regime while fighting against terrorists and insurgents who threaten Iraqis and Americans stationed there.

Mr. Speaker, I stand firm in my resolve to ensure victory not only in Iraq but also in the global war on terror. Secretary Rumsfeld is serving our Nation with dignity and honor and should be treated as such whether you agree with his actions or not.

STRUGGLING FAMILIES

(Ms. SOLIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to highlight the struggle of American working families. The Census Bureau reported that American families are living paycheck to paycheck, struggling to make ends meet and going deeper into debt, even as they are

working harder and are more productive.

Housing costs and interest rates are skyrocketing. The income of American families continues to stagnate even as health care, energy and college costs keep going up. The number of Americans without health insurance has risen by 16 percent to 46 million people, equal to the population of 24 States and the District of Columbia.

This includes more than one-third of my constituents in east Los Angeles and the San Gabriel Valley, not to mention the 5 million more Americans living in poverty under this administration.

We need a new direction to help America's working families achieve the American dream, not more tax breaks for the wealthy oil corporations. I urge my colleagues to please reject the failed economic policies of the Republican Congress and instead honor hard work, fair wages and economic growth.

WINNING THE WAR ON TERRORISM

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, while traveling by bus through the 10 counties of South Carolina's Second Congressional District last month, I spoke with constituents about the resolve of America for victory in the global war on terrorism. I repeatedly heard that we must maintain our resolve for winning this war to protect American families.

As several recent successes prove, we are winning the war on terrorism. Nine men suspected of plotting a terrorist attack in Denmark have been arrested. British police detained 14 people suspected of operating terrorist training camps. Iraqi authorities arrested the number two al Qaeda murderer in Iraq. U.S. and British authorities stopped a plot to target U.S.-bound airplanes. Germany and India foiled terrorist attacks in their homelands.

Countries that were reluctant to join with us in the war on terrorism are learning they cannot escape its effects. This is not just a war against America; this is a war against all freedom-loving nations.

With four sons in the military, I am grateful for the dedication of American servicemembers symbolized by the heroism of Cpl David Weimortz of Irmo.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September 11.

PROBLEMS IN AMERICA

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans went home for a month and listened to people and watched the decimation of Lebanon. They watched the continuing mess in Iraq. The President cancelled the return of 13,000 people, or Mr. Rumsfeld did, and they are

keeping them in Baghdad because the place is in a shambles.

But what do we do when we come back, the first week we are back? Do we discuss those issues, or do we discuss the slaughter of human beings?

No, we are here to deal with horse slaughter. When I was in my district, I don't remember in the 18 years that I have been in my district that I have heard anybody come and say, why don't you stop the slaughter of horses?

What is the matter with the Republican Party? Have you nothing to do? Can't you pass anything on port security? Can't you pass anything on immigration? Can't you pass anything about helping the President get out of Iraq? Or about the economy? Gasoline is \$3 a gallon. You cut the Pell Grants, and you come out worrying about the slaughter of horses. I vote "nay."

BORDER PROTECTION AND SECURITY NOW

(Mrs. CAPITO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, during the August recess, my constituents saw very clearly the need to increase enforcement along our borders. In early August, an illegal immigrant wanted for murder in Texas was found working in a lumberyard near Elkins, West Virginia.

Last week, another illegal immigrant struck and killed 4-year-old Tyler Evans in a car accident in Boone County, West Virginia. The police report alleges that speed and alcohol were factors in the fatal crash. Both illegal immigrants had falsified immigration papers.

I held a roundtable with law enforcement officers and elected leaders and talked with many constituents throughout August to discuss the House border security bill and the Reid-Kennedy amnesty bill. The response was unanimous: No amnesty and increased enforcement along our borders.

We shouldn't stop there. It is critical that we provide employers the ability to check immigration status of employees and hold them accountable for their workers. Clearly, most people who enter illegally are not security threats, but it is critical to our homeland security that we are able to account for the people who enter this country. We need to pass tough immigration reform now. It is too late for Tyler Evans, but we need to act before it is too late for other Americans.

PEOPLE PROTECTION

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, nothing could illustrate more that this Republican Congress is a do-nothing Congress

than the fact that, on the first full day back, the only thing we are dealing with is the Horse Protection Act. The previous speaker on the Republican side talked about immigration reform. When I was back in my district, people wanted to know when this Congress was going to address immigration reform, when we were going to address port security and the rising number of people that have no health insurance. But we not dealing with those issues today, we are dealing with the Horse Protection Act. What about people protection?

Osama bin Laden is still at large. The 9/11 Commission recommendations have not been implemented by this Congress. What about a people or American protection act?

The previous speaker talked about immigration reform. This Republican Congress is not even addressing immigration reform. They have decided they are not going to deal with the issue between now and the end of this congressional session. It is a disgrace. This Republican Congress is doing nothing. It is the biggest do-nothing Congress that we have ever seen. We come here to talk about horse protection. We have been out for 6 weeks. The American people want more.

□ 1015

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 503, AMERICAN HORSE SLAUGHTER PREVENTION ACT

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 981 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 981

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 503) to amend the Horse Protection Act to prohibit the shipping, transporting, moving, delivering, receiving, possessing, purchasing, selling, or donation of horses and other equines to be slaughtered for human consumption, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour and twenty minutes equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question

in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ADERHOLT). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the rule provides 1 hour and 20 minutes of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the majority leader and the minority leader. The rule also provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Horse meat is generally not consumed by people in the United States, but more than approximately 90,000 were slaughtered for human consumption in 2005. Virtually all of those horses were slaughtered for export and sent to the largest markets for that product, to countries such as France and Belgium, where it is commonly served to humans. Another 30,000 were transported from the United States to Canada and Mexico for slaughter. A number of States currently have laws that prohibit slaughter or facilitating the slaughter of horses for human consumption, but there is not a nationwide ban.

Last year during consideration of the fiscal 2006 agriculture appropriations bill, my good friends, distinguished Members Mr. SWEENEY and Mr. WHITFIELD, offered an amendment to that bill that would have prohibited the expenditure of taxpayer dollars for slaughter plant and horse meat inspections, effectively ending the practice. The amendment passed the House with bipartisan support by a strong 269-158 vote. A similar amendment also passed the Senate. However, horse slaughter plants petitioned the USDA to allow fee-for-service inspections whereby the plants pay for the inspections. The USDA granted the request. To get around the limitation amendment, horse slaughter plants made that petition to the USDA to allow for inspections.

The American Horse Slaughter Prevention Act would prohibit an individual from slaughtering a horse for human consumption in the United States and would also prevent the transportation of horses from the

United States to Canada or Mexico for the purpose of slaughter for human food.

This legislation, H.R. 503, was introduced by Mr. SWEENEY and Mr. WHITFIELD. I commend both of them for their hard work on this issue, an issue that obviously is very important to them and their constituents.

I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Florida, for yielding me this time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. MATSUI asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, the rule before the House would make in order H.R. 503, the American Horse Slaughter Prevention Act. This bill has the support of 203 bipartisan co-sponsors, myself included. Passing this bill will end the cruel and barbaric practice of horse slaughter. It will ensure that horses are treated humanely up until their deaths, which is a goal that both supporters and opponents of the legislation can support. It will also improve conditions for living horses.

In my home State of California, for example, we have experienced no increase in cases of horse abuse or neglect since we banned their slaughter in 1998. Horse theft cases in California have declined by 35 percent since then as well.

Simply put, horses are an integral part of our country's culture and history. They do not deserve to be slaughtered in the brutal conditions which they must currently endure before death. American horses deserve better treatment.

But the American people deserve better treatment as well. Unfortunately, the Republican majority in Congress appears focused exclusively on issues which do little to improve the lives of Americans.

A few days ago, we celebrated Labor Day. Yet it is clear that people who work for a living have very little to celebrate. The minimum wage remains unchanged. Our constituents face ever-rising energy prices. Seniors continue to be burdened with high costs for prescription drugs. College graduates are saddled with debt. Other young people cannot afford to attend college at all. And nearly 5 years to the day after September 11, our Nation is still not secure.

These are some of the pressing and critical problems the American people deal with on a daily basis. Congress could easily devote an entire week to each issue, and yet we find ourselves procrastinating. Instead of addressing these challenges that confront our constituents, real issues that impact real people, the majority has chosen to authorize commemorative coins. This Congress cannot bring itself to allow a

clean vote to help hardworking Americans by raising the minimum wage, though not for lack of Democratic proposals to do so. My colleague, Congressman GEORGE MILLER, has introduced a bill that will raise the minimum wage for the first time in nearly a decade, and Congressman HOYER's amendment to the Labor-HHS appropriations bill will do the same.

Unfortunately, these sensible proposals to give working families a boost have either been stalled by the Republican leadership or loaded with poison pills to ensure that Americans go yet another year without a minimum wage increase. We owe it to the hardworking voters who send us to Washington to increase the minimum wage before we adjourn. Instead, the leadership has turned our attention to horses.

The majority also refuses to take action to combat skyrocketing energy costs. Democrats have advocated for an innovative and strategic national energy policy, one which rolls back tax breaks for oil companies and invests the savings in alternative fuel sources. Not only will such action lower energy costs over the long term, but it will also help our Nation break our dependence on foreign oil.

The American people deserve an energy policy that is responsible, innovative, and independent. Dozens of promising proposals for such a policy have been introduced, proposals which could be brought to the floor today. However, the leadership has decided instead to use one of our few remaining legislative days to debate horses.

Even before this energy crisis, the steady rise in health costs threatened to drive many middle-class families out of our health care system altogether. Most of the 3 million people who have lost health coverage since 2002 make over \$50,000 per year, and some make over \$75,000 per year. This figure is frightening, for it indicates that high insurance costs are affecting more and more Americans. Additionally, seniors have already begun to hit the "doughnut hole" in the Medicare prescription drug program, which has forced them to bear thousands of dollars in unexpected costs.

The Democratic plan for the future gives the Federal Government the freedom to negotiate for lower prescription drug prices. It also provides millions of American families with urgently needed health insurance. We owe it to our constituents to reform the health care system to make it more affordable before we adjourn.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that this Congress has done little to help American seniors. Sadly, younger Americans have not fared much better. The Republican leadership has left our Nation's students saddled with ever-growing amounts of student loan debt.

Democrats have offered a new direction for higher education, centered on expanding Pell grants and restoring the \$12 billion in cuts to student aid which Republicans passed earlier this

year. This will ease the debt burden for recent graduates and put the dream of a college education within reach for more young Americans. We owe it to our students and to the families who support them to increase tuition assistance before we adjourn. However, the leadership has ignored this opportunity to make higher education accessible and affordable. Instead, the majority has decided to take another long weekend, with no votes scheduled on Monday or Friday.

As we can see, the list of misplaced priorities in the 109th Congress is long. However, perhaps none is as disappointing or as dangerous as Congress's refusal to secure our homeland. The majority has refused to fully implement all the recommendations of the September 11 commission. In doing so, it has left unnecessary holes in national security and has failed to fulfill its primary responsibility to ensure America's safety.

Before we adjourn for the year, Congress must secure our borders, and we must do more to protect our ports and airports. Democrats have offered legislation to do so, legislation which will also provide our first responders with the resources they need to respond to a terrorist attack or other national emergency.

These proposals to protect American lives and families are on the table, and Democrats stand ready to pass them with the help of our Republican colleagues. And yet as we return from a month-long break, we have been presented with a paper-thin legislative agenda. This week's schedule illustrates how out of touch this Chamber's leadership is from American families and the problems they face every day.

As a result, on the floor of the House of Representatives this week, we will focus on improving the welfare of America's horses. What we should be doing is improving the welfare of America's people.

My Democratic colleagues and I have offered a new direction, a plan to raise the minimum wage, ease our reliance on foreign energy sources, lower prescription drug prices, make college more affordable, and strengthen our Nation's security to combat terrorists.

□ 1030

We will continue to fight to pass this package of urgent national legislation, and we await the cooperation of Republican colleagues to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY), a prime author of this legislation.

(Mr. SWEENEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the rule and its underlying bill. But I do want to respond to my friends on the other side

and their comments about the appropriateness of this particular piece of legislation, which I believe they support being on the floor here.

Since 1979, there have been efforts and attempts and a struggle to bring this piece of legislation to the floor for open public debate so that we can flush out the fact from the fiction.

And while I know and I believe over the next month we will be debating a number of important issues, like border security, like protecting this Nation, and our war on terror, this is a piece of legislation that is long overdue and needs to be discussed and needs to be disposed of in an appropriate fashion.

As author of the legislation, I have worked tirelessly to bring it to the floor. What the bill does is it prohibits the shipping, transporting, moving, delivering, receiving, possessing, purchasing, selling or donation of horses or other equines for the slaughter for human consumption.

It makes it impossible to do so in the United States but also prohibits the transport to Canada and Mexico. And some might ask, why is that important? Well, it is important for a number of reasons. The first and foremost is that it is one of the most inhumane, brutal, shady practices going on today in this Nation.

It is important because more than 70 percent of the American people, at least every survey I have ever seen, support the notion that we ought to ban the slaughter of horses for human consumption. It is important because a substantial number of States have outlawed this practice, yet because of a Federal court case, an injunction has been obtained in which the court has essentially said, unless Congress acts, this practice can go on despite the will of the people and the States involved.

For years I had hoped for a fair and honest debate on this issue. We have been thwarted in that effort until now. Each year, 90,000 horses in the country are slaughtered and shipped overseas to Europe and Asia where they are served in restaurants as a delicacy, not as a necessity. I want this process stopped, and some of my colleagues in this chamber do not.

This rule gives us the opportunity for that fair and open debate. I want to thank the Rules Committee and its chairman, Mr. DREIER, for that opportunity. However, I must stress that I have real concerns over the seven amendments that are possibly going to be introduced in the course of today's debate.

I have concerns about it, because they are being introduced by people who have for a long time tried to stop this debate from happening in the first instance, and, therefore, then I would suggest that every one of these amendments are poison pills. Every one of these amendments are intended for one thing, that is to continue this practice, a practice that I do not want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, is subsidized by this Federal Government.

Now, last year, my good friend from Florida pointed out, last year we passed with 269 votes an amendment in the ag appropriation bill that said taxpayer dollars should not be used for something the American people do not support in the first instance; should not be used to subsidize and continue this process.

Despite passing that piece of legislation, the USDA and others thwarted our efforts to have the right thing happen.

I would suggest to my colleagues that today we send a strong message: We end this practice. And, yes, let's get on with the other business of this House. But after many, many years, three decades of attempts, it is about time we passed this legislation and ended this practice.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my good friend, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, with energy costs at an all-time high in the United States, climate change threatening the future prosperity of our country and our planet, the Taliban regaining control in Afghanistan, Iraq in meltdown, the U.S. saddled with the largest debt in the history of the world, the real wages of average Americans in decline, 42 million Americans without health care insurance, and most of the 9/11 Commission recommendations to make America safe still not implemented by this Congress, it is unbelievable to me that we are spending this day on the horse meat bill.

Now I commute 3,000 miles from California to Washington to serve the people, as we all do, to serve the people. And I am for the horsies, too. I will vote for it. We could have done it by consent. We could have done it on voice vote.

I cannot believe that we are here today using the very limited time left to this Congress to deal with horse meat. Now, I hope that we can come to our senses, that the Republican leadership in this House will get a grip about what the American public needs us to do to serve their interests, to make sure that they are secure, both from an economic point of view, from international terrorism and to deal with the terrible disaster that has become Iraq and the disaster that is growing in Afghanistan.

As I say, I am happy to vote for the horsie bill, but I am ashamed that that is all we are doing here today.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Agriculture Committee, Mr. GOODLATTE.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 503 has not received the support of any House committee and was, in fact, ordered to be reported unfavorably to the floor with the recommendation that it not pass by an overwhelming bipartisan majority of 37-3 of the Agriculture Committee. So, naturally, the

Members of that committee are very sympathetic with those who do not want to hear this legislation today.

The committee rejected this legislation because it has real concerns that eliminating the option of humane euthanasia at horse-processing facilities will do undeniable harm to the welfare of the 90,000 unwanted horses per year that normally go this route. This rule makes in order several amendments that seek to correct some of the problems created by this bill.

Since H.R. 503 leaves so many questions unanswered, the amendments are the only means to provide solutions to the problems. What happens to those 90,000 horses? H.R. 503 provides no answer to that question. Will they be guaranteed a safe, healthy future by the passage of H.R. 503? Sadly, the answer is, no.

H.R. 503 provides no provisions for the welfare of these unwanted horses. Proponents suggest that these 90,000 horses will not all necessarily be absorbed by the rescue facilities but will instead be sold to new owners or kept longer by their current owners. Many of the horses received by these processing plants are traditionally unserviceable, vivacious or behaviorally unacceptable in today's equine community.

Holding on to a dangerous horse presents a potentially dangerous situation for the owner and his or her family. And selling the dangerous horse to an unwitting buyer is irresponsible. Obviously, the idea of sending a horse to a processing facility is not something any of us would like to think about. But for certain horses, these facilities, which are federally regulated with on-site U.S. Department of Agriculture veterinarians and humane euthanasia and processing conditions that are acceptable to the both the American Veterinary Medical Association and the American Association of Equine Practitioners provide a humane alternative to additional suffering or possibly dangerous situations.

In order to ensure the welfare of these animals while they are alive, it is imperative that all humane disposal options be available. A responsible horse owner has the right to choose, and although we may not agree, we need to respect that right.

H.R. 503 is a deceptive piece of legislation. Much of the misinformation that surrounds this bill has led many to believe it will accomplish things that it is not capable of achieving. Make no mistake about it: H.R. 503 will not prevent horses from dying. Proponents note that an alternative to sending the horses to processing facilities is to put the horse down on the farm. Apparently, the alternative to death is, well, death.

The euthanasia practices employed at the three U.S. processing facilities meet the humane euthanasia guidelines of the American Veterinary Medical Association, and the regulations established by the U.S. Department of Agriculture for humane euthanasia.

The proponents of H.R. 503 are not arguing to keep horses alive or maintain a standard of care to ensure the horse's welfare; they are arguing about what happens to the meat once the animal has been euthanized. Furthermore, the humane treatment of these horses is regulated from the moment the decision is made to send the horse to the processing facility.

The Commercial Transportation of Equine for Slaughter Act regulates the transportation of the horses to the facility, preventing the transport or euthanasia of injured horses. This bill raises many questions about the welfare of horses but provides no solutions. If you care about animal warfare, vote against H.R. 503. If you care about horses, vote against this bill.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, the rule governing the debate on H.R. 503 makes in order seven amendments, all but one of which were filed late, beyond the deadline for amendment submission with the Rules Committee.

What does this suggest? Normally, as we know, the Rules Committee is not enthused with late-filed amendments. As I recall, the majority on the Rules Committee has even used this as an excuse to not make certain amendments in order.

So I think those of us on both sides of the aisle are being sent a signal here. And that message is that there is a concerted effort among some in power in this body to torpedo the pending legislation, H.R. 503, by gaining the adoption of nefarious and ill-conceived amendments that would simply gut the legislation. This is the hand that we are being dealt. And it is apparently the one that we must play.

With that said, I rise in support of the rule. I urge my colleagues, especially on my side of the aisle, to vote for it, so at the very least, we can have an open debate on the issue of horse slaughter in the United States, so that we can strive to keep hope alive.

Americans do not eat horse flesh. The concept is repugnant to most Americans. Yet the merchants of slaughter will have us believe that it is fine and dandy to slaughter our horses for the sole purpose, the sole purpose, of sending their flesh overseas to support some warped demand among foreign diners for horse meat on their menus.

Hear me and hear me now: America, the land of the brave and true, we are sending over 90,000 horses a year to slaughter. Stunned in the head if lucky, throats slit. Explain this to your children. Try to defend this to your constituents.

I hope my colleague will vote for the rule, demonstrate that we will stand up to the likes of those who slaughter our horses for profit and slaughter our horses for power.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes

to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD), who has done so much to bring this legislation to the floor.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to thank the Rules Committee for bringing this rule to the floor on this important issue. I might say that the first legislation introduced in the U.S. Congress to try to curtail the slaughter of American horses for human consumption was back in the mid-1970s. And year after year after year after year, the Ag Committee refused to take any action. They never had a hearing. They did everything that they could do to defeat this bill and to make sure that it never saw the light of day.

Well, today we have the opportunity to vote on this bill to have a free and open discussion about the importance of this bill and to make the American people recognize and realize that there are only three slaughter plants in the U.S. operating where the horses are being slaughtered for human consumption. Every one of them is owned by foreign interests, by the Belgians, by the Dutch and by the French.

All of the meat is exported to Europe. Now, the Fort Worth newspaper today had an editorial opposed to this bill and what they said reflects the inaccuracy about this bill. They talked about how pet food is made from horse meat. The truth of the matter is, the pet food association has not used horse meat for 12 years.

□ 1045

That is just one of the inaccuracies. Horse slaughter is about a process. There are groups of killer buyers around America who will obtain horses by any means possible, by theft, by misrepresentation.

Skye Dutcher, a young girl from New York, came to Washington just yesterday to tell us the story about on her 12th birthday her horse was stolen from her family's farm. A fellow took it to a killer buyer, and he received \$150. The killer buyer took it to the auction, and the horse was taken to slaughter.

Judy Taylor, in my State of Kentucky, had two Appaloosas, and she had cancer. She gave them to a friend who said, I will take care of them. That friend sold them to a killer buyer. The killer buyer took them to Beltex in Fort Worth, Texas, where they were slaughtered.

So the nasty part of this business is that so many horses are being obtained illegally, and I know of very few industries in America today where the products that they are using are obtained illegally.

We hear a lot about these unwanted horses and what are we going to do with 90,000 horses that have not been slaughtered. I would say to you that 12 years ago 300,000 horses were slaughtered each year. Today, that number is down to 87,000 because the demand is going down. With that kind of a drastic reduction, you would think there are a

lot of unwanted horses running around the country. Yet there is not one study anywhere that indicates that there is an abundance of horses. In fact, as I said, most of the horses that are being slaughtered are wanted. The owners would love to have them back, but because of this process, this is what is happening.

The State of Texas had a law on its books that made it illegal to use horse meat for human consumption, to buy it or sell it or transport it. They tried to shut down the slaughterhouses in Texas. The prosecutors were getting ready to go to court, and the foreign owners filed a lawsuit in Federal court. They won that lawsuit because the Federal judge said this is about interstate commerce and the State of Texas will be impeding interstate commerce by trying to shut these slaughterhouses down.

So the only thing that we can do is if it is going to be changed, Congress has to do it. That is what this bill is about today. H.R. 503 is on the floor because Congress wants to take action.

Every poll that has been taken on this issue, the American people support the prohibition of slaughtering horses. Horses have never been a part of the food chain. They are not like cattle. They are not like pigs. They are not like goats. Those animals are raised for slaughter; and when you take it to auction, you know where it is going to end up. That is not the case with horses.

I think that this is going to be quite an interesting debate, a worthwhile debate; and I want to thank the Rules Committee for giving us this opportunity today.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge all Members to support the rule and the underlying bill. Congress should do the right thing for America's horses by ending the cruel practice of horse slaughter.

But, Mr. Speaker, there are a larger set of priorities which must be addressed. The American worker deserves an increase in the minimum wage, and our Nation's seniors deserve lower prescription drug prices. Almost 5 years after September 11, failing to secure America's ports and airports is unconscionable.

Democrats are committed to staying here until these priorities are accomplished. I would urge all my colleagues to join us in this effort.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I also yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 351, nays 40, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 430]

YEAS—351

Ackerman	Edwards	Larsen (WA)
Aderholt	Ehlers	Larson (CT)
Akin	Emerson	Latham
Alexander	Engel	LaTourette
Allen	English (PA)	Leach
Baca	Eshoo	Lee
Bachus	Etheridge	Levin
Baker	Everett	Lewis (KY)
Barrett (SC)	Farr	Linder
Bartlett (MD)	Feeney	Lipinski
Barton (TX)	Ferguson	LoBiondo
Bass	Filner	Lofgren, Zoe
Bean	Fitzpatrick (PA)	Lowey
Berkley	Flake	Lucas
Berman	Foley	Lungren, Daniel E.
Biggert	Forbes	Lynch
Bilbray	Fortenberry	Mack
Bishop (GA)	Fossella	Maloney
Bishop (NY)	Fox	Manzullo
Bishop (UT)	Frank (MA)	Marchant
Blackburn	Franks (AZ)	Markey
Blunt	Frelinghuysen	Marshall
Boehlert	Garrett (NJ)	Matheson
Boehner	Gerlach	Matsui
Bonilla	Gibbons	McCarthy
Bonner	Gilchrest	McCaul (TX)
Bono	Gillmor	McCollum (MN)
Boozman	Gingrey	McCotter
Boren	Gohmert	McCrery
Boucher	Gonzalez	McDermott
Boustany	Goode	McHenry
Boyd	Goodlatte	McHugh
Bradley (NH)	Gordon	McIntyre
Brady (PA)	Granger	McKeon
Brady (TX)	Graves	McMorris
Brown (OH)	Green, Al	Rodgers
Brown (SC)	Green, Gene	McNulty
Brown, Corrine	Grijalva	Meehan
Brown-Waite, Ginny	Gutierrez	Meek (FL)
Burgess	Gutknecht	Meeks (NY)
Burton (IN)	Hall	Mica
Butterfield	Harman	Millender-McDonald
Buyer	Hart	Miller (FL)
Calvert	Hastings (WA)	Miller (MI)
Camp (MI)	Hayes	Miller (NC)
Campbell (CA)	Hayworth	Miller, George
Cannon	Hefley	Mollohan
Cantor	Hensarling	Moore (WI)
Capito	Hерger	Moran (KS)
Capps	Higgins	Musgrave
Cardoza	Hinojosa	Myrick
Carnahan	Hoekstra	Napolitano
Carson	Holden	Neal (MA)
Carter	Holt	Neugebauer
Case	Hoolley	Northup
Chabot	Hostettler	Norwood
Chocoma	Hoyer	Ortiz
Clay	Hulshof	Otter
Cleaver	Hunter	Oxley
Clyburn	Inglis (SC)	Pallone
Coble	Inslee	Pascarell
Cole (OK)	Israel	Pastor
Conaway	Issa	Paul
Cooper	Jackson (IL)	Payne
Costa	Jackson-Lee	Pearce
Cramer	(TX)	Pelosi
Crenshaw	Jefferson	Pence
Crowley	Jenkins	Peterson (PA)
Cuellar	Jindal	Petri
Culberson	Johnson (CT)	Pickering
Davis (AL)	Johnson, E. B.	Pitts
Davis (CA)	Jones (NC)	Platts
Davis (FL)	Jones (OH)	Poe
Davis (IL)	Kaptur	Pombo
Davis (KY)	Keller	Porter
Davis (TN)	Kelly	Price (GA)
Davis, Jo Ann	Kennedy (MN)	Price (NC)
Davis, Tom	Kildee	Pryce (OH)
Deal (GA)	Kilpatrick (MI)	Putnam
DeGette	Kind	Radanovich
Delahunt	King (IA)	Rahall
DeLauro	King (NY)	Ramstad
Dent	Kingston	Rangel
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kline	Regula
Diaz-Balart, M.	Knollenberg	Rehberg
Dicks	Kolbe	Reichert
Dingell	Kucinich	Renzi
Doggett	Kuhl (NY)	Reyes
Doolittle	LaHood	Reynolds
Dreier	Langevin	Rogers (AL)
Duncan	Lantos	

Rogers (KY)	Shays	Tiberi
Rogers (MI)	Sherman	Tierney
Rohrabacher	Sherwood	Turner
Ros-Lehtinen	Shimkus	Udall (CO)
Ross	Shuster	Upton
Rothman	Simmons	Van Hollen
Roybal-Allard	Simpson	Visclosky
Ruppersberger	Smith (NJ)	Walden (OR)
Ryan (OH)	Smith (TX)	Walsh
Ryan (WI)	Smith (WA)	Wamp
Ryun (KS)	Sodrel	Wasserman
Sabo	Souder	Schultz
Salazar	Spratt	Waters
Sanchez, Loretta	Stark	Watson
Sanders	Stearns	Weiner
Saxton	Stupak	Weldon (FL)
Schakowsky	Sullivan	Weldon (PA)
Schiff	Sweeney	Weller
Schmidt	Tancredo	Westmoreland
Schwartz (PA)	Tauscher	Wexler
Schwarz (MI)	Taylor (NC)	Whitfield
Scott (GA)	Terry	Wicker
Scott (VA)	Thomas	Wilson (NM)
Sensenbrenner	Thompson (CA)	Wilson (SC)
Serrano	Thompson (MS)	Wolf
Shadegg	Thornberry	Woolsey
Shaw	Tiahrt	Wynn

NAYS—40

Abercrombie	Hereth	Pomeroy
Baird	Hinchey	Skelton
Baldwin	Kanjorski	Slaughter
Barrow	Kennedy (RI)	Snyder
Berry	Lewis (GA)	Solis
Blumenauer	McGovern	Tanner
Boswell	Melancon	Taylor (MS)
Capuano	Michaud	Udall (NM)
Castle	Moore (KS)	Velázquez
Chandler	Moran (VA)	Watt
Conyers	Oberstar	Waxman
Costello	Obey	Wu
DeFazio	Olver	
Ford	Peterson (MN)	

NOT VOTING—41

Andrews	Harris	Ney
Beauprez	Hastings (FL)	Nunes
Becerra	Hobson	Nussle
Bilirakis	Hyde	Osborne
Cardin	Istook	Owens
Cubin	Johnson (IL)	Royce
Cummings	Johnson, Sam	Rush
Doyle	Kirk	Sánchez, Linda T.
Drake	Lewis (CA)	Sessions
Emanuel	McKinney	Strickland
Evans	Miller, Gary	Towns
Fattah	Murphy	Young (AK)
Gallegly	Murtha	Young (FL)
Green (WI)	Nadler	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1114

Messrs. PETERSON of Minnesota, POMEROY, and KENNEDY of Rhode Island changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. MEEHAN changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, due to circumstances beyond my control on Thursday, September 7, 2006, I regrettably missed the vote on H. Res. 981, a bill providing for consideration of H.R. 503, the Horse Protection Act.

H. Res. 981 presents a reasonable rule that made several amendments in order, and allowed adequate time to have a full and fair debate on the underlying bill.

In turn, I would have voted “yea” on H. Res. 981, so that we could begin to consider the underlying provisions of H.R. 503.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, I was unavoidably detained and missed one rollcall vote. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall vote No. 430.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 430, had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

PERMISSION TO REDUCE TIME FOR ELECTRONIC VOTING DURING FURTHER PROCEEDINGS IN THE HOUSE AND IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, during further proceedings today in the House and in the Committee of the Whole, the Chair be authorized to reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any question that otherwise could be subjected to 5-minute voting under clause 8 or 9 of rule XX or under clause 6 of rule XVIII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 5122, G.V. “SONNY” MONTGOMERY NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 5122), to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. EDWARDS

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Edwards moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 5122 be instructed to agree to the provisions contained in section 721 of the Senate amendment (relating to treatment of TRICARE retail pharmacy network under Federal procurement of pharmaceuticals).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the fiscal year 2007 defense authorization bill passed the House on May 11 and the Senate on

June 22. It is deeply disappointing that during a time of war it has taken the House and Senate Republican leadership over 2½ months to appoint conferees to write the final defense bill, which includes programs vital to our troops and to our Nation's defense. The fact that Speaker HASTERT could take time to campaign in over 40 House districts during the August recess, but could not find time to appoint final defense conferees, represents the kind of misplaced priorities that have Americans demanding that Congress change its way of business. Our troops in Afghanistan and Iraq should not have had to wait 2½ months to see Congress moving ahead on a bill that is vital to them, their mission and their families.

Now that conferees have finally been appointed, the House has a serious responsibility to support a bill that puts our troops and military retirees first. That is what this motion to instruct is all about.

Specifically, this motion would instruct House conferees on the defense bill to accept Senate language that would reduce the cost of prescription drugs for military retirees, including Iraqi war veterans, by hundreds of millions of dollars each year. It would do so by saying that pharmaceutical manufacturers should give the same drug discount at retail pharmacies that is already being given to military retirees who buy their drugs via mail order.

The Veterans Administration saves hundreds of millions of dollars every year by requiring drug manufacturers to offer veterans drug discounts, and applying the same commonsense principle to military retirees will result in huge savings. In fact, this motion, if accepted, would save taxpayers \$251 million in fiscal year 2007 and help, even more importantly, up to 1.9 million military retirees by making it unnecessary to pass the unfair House provision, another provision, that would force a 100 percent increase in generic drug copays at local pharmacist for military retirees and a 77 percent increase in brand-name drug copays for military retirees.

The bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is that this motion is good for American taxpayers and good for our military retirees, who are men and women who have served their Nation for 20 or 30 or more years in uniform.

There is just one problem: the pharmaceutical manufacturers do not want military retirees on the TRICARE health plan to be able to buy discounted drugs at local pharmacies. Why? Because it would cut into their already rather substantial profits.

The choice is clear. The motion is a choice between helping our military retirees, including Iraqi war veterans, or helping the pharmaceutical companies make even higher profits. I am confident that the vast majority of Americans would say that the pocketbooks of those who have served our Nation for decades in uniform should take priority over higher profits for pharmaceutical manufacturers.

The real question is whether this House in voting on this motion will reflect the values of our constituents and our military retirees, or will we reflect the special interests of the pharmaceutical manufacturers and their lobbyists.

The choice should be an easy one. But it appears that the House leadership didn't want this provision included in this motion to help our military retirees, and they did not support this language, which the Senate adopted and put in the House bill. That is why we are here today facing this motion. I salute the other body for having put the discounted drug price language in their defense bill, which passed the Senate on an overwhelming bipartisan basis.

I urge support, Mr. Speaker, for this motion. I hope we will receive bipartisan support. Going along with the pharmaceutical manufacturers should not trump saving taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars, keeping drug costs affordable for our military retirees, up to 1.9 million of them, and allowing our military retirees to have access to their local pharmacist.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), a senior member of the House Armed Services Committee and a great supporter of our servicemen and -women and our veterans and military retirees.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, let's make something clear: the Veterans Health Care Act of 1992 directs drug companies to grant discounts on all drugs that are supplied to the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Public Health Service, and the Coast Guard. These are significant discounts. On average they lower the cost to the government for pharmaceuticals provided to beneficiaries by 30 to 40 percent. The Department of Defense is able to take advantage of these discounts in its mail order program and in dispensing drugs in its military treatment facilities, hospitals and clinics.

But the pharmaceutical companies have been balking, refusing to grant these discounts to TRICARE beneficiaries. Those are the families of active duty members and families of reservists deployed. TRICARE beneficiaries, wanting to shop, understandably, with their local pharmacy, their local corner drugstore, they have not been able to obtain the advantages of these discounted drug prices.

The Senate has recognized the problem here and has acted to resolve it by simply providing that in the future, after this bill becomes law, the discounted drug provision will apply not just to military treatment facilities, not just to the mail order program, but to TRICARE beneficiaries going to private drugstores. And it should. Can

anybody tell me a reason it should not? Can anybody tell me a reason that TRICARE beneficiaries, our military members, shouldn't be able to shop, when necessary, at their local pharmacy?

That is all we are doing here. The Senate approved this 92-0, and we are simply saying here, let us recede to the Senate provision, let us take a law adopted in 1992 and apply it to all aspects of military health care.

This has a couple of collateral benefits in addition to saving money. One is that the House provision, which raises copays for drugs purchased otherwise at military facilities, will not be necessary because we will save enough money here to make it unnecessary. Another is that the Senate provision, harsh I think, which requires mandatory mail order as opposed to local pharmacies, that provision too can be dispensed with because we will save enough money to do so.

This is a win-win-win proposition. There is no reason the House should not take up the logic and policy of the Senate bill and adopt this same provision. Every Member here should vote to instruct our conferees to recede to the Senate on this critical provision. It will save money and make life better for our TRICARE beneficiaries. There is no reason not to do it. There is every reason to do it. I urge its support.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the absence of speakers on the other side of the aisle is a reflection that there will be bipartisan support for this motion to instruct the House conferees on the defense bill. If so, then I think that is very good news for our military retirees.

I certainly want to express my respect to my friend and colleague, Mr. HEFLEY, who is a great champion for our military, both those on active duty and our retirees.

What is a little bit disconcerting, Mr. Speaker, is how we can have what at least at this moment might appear to be unanimous support for this provision to save hundreds of millions of dollars for taxpayers and military retirees by reducing the cost of military retiree prescription drugs at pharmacies and have the Senate adopt this provision as well, and yet mysteriously it didn't show up in the markup in the House Armed Services Committee.

I don't know what happened. I have heard some rumors suggesting that the House leadership opposed putting this provision, helping our military retirees and saving taxpayers money, into the bill. Perhaps someone could explain to the House and our colleagues and those listening, Mr. Speaker, why this provision wasn't put in the markup of the bill in the first place. But I am not sure anybody has an explanation that could withstand the light of day.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD), a distinguished veteran himself.

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Texas. I won't take 3 minutes. But I will say this, Mr. Speaker, that any time you have a provision, a legislative proposal that saves in performing our legislative duties and our executive duties, saves the taxpayers money and also enables us to better serve those that we are serving in our communities, that is a plus. That is a win-win, as some have said.

That is exactly what this provision we are discussing that is in the Senate bill does. In this case, obviously, it will save Federal taxpayer money. And we all know the issues that exist today in our budgeting process. We have red ink throughout our future budgeting process as far as the eye can see. There is a structural deficit built into the budgeting process, which has been extended by this administration and this Congress.

□ 1130

So, in this case, we are helping those that are our military retirees, those who we have asked to put on the uniform and go into battle, and many of them come back wounded, injured, and then the taxpayer has responsibility for seeing that those folks are cared for the balance of their lives. This is not a new debate about military retirees and how we provide them medical services.

So if we can do a better job of that back home, and the Senate has a better idea in this case, then we should go to it. I think that is what we are asking the folks to do. We are saving money, and we are providing a better service, better quality services to the folks that we have asked to wear the uniform.

I thank the gentleman for bringing the motion to instruct.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying in the gentleman from Texas' home State, when you have struck oil, stop drilling.

And you have struck oil here, and we are not objecting. Trying to take care of our veterans in the best way we possibly can is not a Democrat or a Republican thing. It is not a partisan thing. It is a thing that I think both sides of the aisle feel very, very strongly about.

With that, I don't think I have any further speakers. I reserve the balance of my time, unless you are ready to wind this up.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I have one more speaker, Mr. BERRY of Arkansas, whom I would like to recognize. I would like to say that Mr. BERRY led the charge to send a letter to the chairman and the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee urging the adoption of this language, and I salute him for his leadership on that effort.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY).

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas, and I thank

him for his leadership in all matters pertaining to the military and certainly to our veterans in their care, and they are entitled to the best that this country has to offer. I appreciate him, and I also appreciate the gentleman from Colorado.

He is absolutely right. This is not a partisan issue. We should do everything within our power to see that the taxpayers get a good deal, but we have an obligation to our veterans and our retired military that should not be usurped by anyone, any time, any place. They should get the best that we have.

I am amazed that we have even got to deal with this on the House floor. This should have been taken care of a long time ago, and many of us felt like it was taken care of in the Veterans Health Care Act of 1992.

But the amazing thing to me is that we would even consider giving mail order, large corporation pharmacies a huge advantage over the local retail pharmacies, especially in rural America and in the neighborhoods. This is what is going to happen if we don't put this in this final defense authorization bill.

Our veterans should be able to go to any local pharmacy that is the front line health care provider for every community. They should be able to go to those local pharmacies and take advantage of generally free services by well-trained and accomplished professionals that know them and know their health needs and know what medicine they are taking, and those retail establishments should be able to get their pharmaceuticals at the same price that DOD gets them and the same price that the mail order companies get them and be able to provide this service to our veterans.

So I am delighted to hear the gentleman from Colorado say that they have no objections. I think that is a very wise thing.

Again, I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for doing good work, and let us move this forward, and let us see that our veterans get the care that they deserve, and our retired military and their families get the care that they deserve, and let us move on to the other problems that we can solve in this same way, working together for the common good.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, could I ask the gentleman from Colorado if he has any speakers on this?

Mr. HEFLEY. I may have one speaker who has just arrived.

Mr. EDWARDS. Okay. Since we have used more of our time, and since we may not have to use the entire time allotted, could I yield back, not my time, but to the gentleman from Colorado for the purposes of his speaker being recognized.

Mr. HEFLEY. I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER).

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I am just now reading this. Mr. EDWARDS, this is

a very bad idea. If you support increasing the cost of medications to veterans, then support this motion to instruct.

If you support increasing the cost to veterans to obtain access to their drugs, support this motion to instruct.

Over the years, those of us have guarded, guarded the Federal Supply Schedule. Now, why did Congress pass the Federal Supply Schedule? Because we said, you know, we have said to veterans out there, whom are disabled, we recognize that they are a precious part of our society, so we create the Federal Supply Schedule, which is really the government mandating a particular price, and then we jealously guard that. We jealously guard that. Why? Because everybody wants to gain access to the FSS, the Federal Supply Schedule.

I have to come to the floor, as chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, appalled, appalled. I am just dumbfounded that we are, what, going to vote on a motion to instruct that we should accept what the Senate does?

It seems that some people in this body are possessed in their fight against drug companies. Oh, my gosh, these drug companies are trying to seek all kinds of profits. I like to beat up on drug companies, until you get sick yourself, and then you want to gain access to all these types of drugs whether it is for Medicare pricing or Medicaid pricing, DOD.

I created the retail TRICARE pharmacy program. It took me 3 years to do that. If I ever intended for FSS pricing to be included, I would have included it in the bill. It is a retail program. As a matter of fact, I created the out-of-network retail pharmacy network to give these veterans a choice, the military retirees, so that they can gain access to some new blockbuster drug and pay a little bit more money for it.

But, please, my colleagues, do not, just before an election, open up the Federal Supply Schedule. Do not do this. We do this to protect very important members of our society who have been injured, and the disabled.

Now, what has been challenging to us is that Congress then, subsequent to having passed this, the Federal Supply Schedule, to gain access to lower cost medications for these disabled veterans, we opened up access to the VA. You have individuals who have gained greater access into the VA.

That begins an erosion. I understand that. Now we say, oh, my gosh, if these veterans are gaining access to the Federal Supply Schedule, then what about members to DOD. Oh, by the way, let's do it for Medicare and let's do it for Medicaid.

As you increase the pool of people, you are increasing the price of the medications to the very same people that you originally sought to protect. This is one of those moments where you have to scratch your head and say, what are we doing?

I make an appeal. I come to the floor and appeal to your good conscience and

to your senses: Do not support this motion to instruct.

Now, I warned the Department of Defense. I knew that if they didn't have authority to do what they wanted to do, they wanted to gain access to rebates, I understand what they sought to do. You see, I put it in the bill that asked them to go after best business practices.

Well, the best business practices, they then interpret that is that they get the same types of rebates that they get in the private sector. So they created something called a warehousing, a virtual warehouse. They had to create the virtual warehouse because we in Congress gave them no authority, no authority to warehouse to gain access to the rebates under the Federal Supply Schedule. It just blows my mind.

I warned DOD about this. I had my conversations with Dr. Winkenwerder. But, you know what, he felt like he was on solid ground. I believe he built a house of cards. It has all fallen around him. He bet on the budget. He is short. He turns to Congress. He asks all of you to try to help him out of the jam he has got himself in.

I knew a lawsuit was coming. I knew that a lawsuit was going to come because the DOD was doing this without any express authority of Congress.

So let me just include an appeal, once again, to the good senses of my colleagues: Do not extend FSS pricing to other departments or agencies of government. Protect the veterans; protect those who are disabled. I just appeal to you. Don't do this.

Actually, Mr. EDWARDS, I would ask you to withdraw the motion to instruct.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

I have great respect for my colleague, the Chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. He and I have worked together for many years on veterans' programs. I have never questioned his motivations; I just question his judgment in this particular case.

But he asked a fair question: What are we doing? Let me answer that question. What this motion to instruct would do is allow military retirees, up to 1.9 million of them, to get the same discounted drug prices at a retail pharmacist that the law already ensures they receive if they buy those drugs via mail order or if they go into a dispensary at a DOD hospital somewhere.

What are we doing? We are saving, according to estimates, \$251 million this year for taxpayers, lowering the cost of prescription drugs for these vast numbers of military retirees.

What are we doing? We are perhaps saving enough money so that the Defense conferees don't have to actually force a 100 percent increase in the copay for generic drugs to military retirees and a 77 percent increase in the copay for military retirees to buy name-brand drugs. That is what we are doing.

What we are doing is taking a law that was passed in 1992 that the Vet-

erans Administration in 2002 said provides the authority to provide this discount to retail pharmacies and just clarifying that law.

Apparently, it wasn't the Department of Defense or Veterans' Administration that opposed the kind of language I am supporting; it was the drug companies who filed lawsuits in this matter, to prevent military retirees from getting cheaper prices. I don't find the pharmaceutical manufacturers filing lawsuits so that they could make less money.

Mr. BUYER. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS. I would be happy to yield to you.

Mr. BUYER. The rebates go to the government, they do not go to the military retiree. Therefore, the price is not affected by the military.

Mr. EDWARDS. I appreciate the gentleman pointing that out. That is why I say this \$251 million in savings in fiscal year 2007, that is projected to be over \$300 million in savings in fiscal year 2009, can be used by the House-Senate conferees to reduce the copay that was put in the House bill that some may have felt was necessary for financial reasons.

But if we can find savings to the taxpayers in the Department of Defense, let's pass on those savings to our military retirees. I don't think Members of Congress are being asked during a time of war to pay 100 percent more copay for our prescription drugs. I don't think military retirees ought to be asked to pay 100 percent increase in their copays.

Mr. BUYER. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS. I would be glad to yield.

Mr. BUYER. That is a valued argument from your position, given how you have drafted the motion to instruct. That is a valued argument.

I would just ask of the gentleman that when we extend price controls to a greater population, as we contend, whether it is military retirees as you are talking about or whether we go to Medicaid or Medicare, what happens is we begin, at some point, we begin to dull our efforts on research and development and going after whatever the new blockbuster drug is that presses the bounds of science that our society gets to enjoy, improves the quality of our lives.

□ 1145

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I would say, at some point, if the drug companies are not making a reasonable profit, it could significantly impact the money they invest in research. But I don't think many in this country today would doubt that the drug companies are making very healthy profits. And I do salute them on the research that they put into coming up with new miracle drugs, but at the same time, I think it is a fact that they spend more on advertising on television on the

drugs than they spend on research and development for their drugs.

So out of the multibillion-dollar profits that all of our drug companies make on their drugs, I have a hard time thinking that allowing us to save \$251 million this coming year on the cost of retail drugs for military retirees is going to put a significant crimp in the ability of drug companies to invest in future drugs.

I agree with the gentleman, the drug companies ought to be able to make a reasonable profit. I think they are making a reasonable profit. Many Americans think that they are making more than a reasonable profit.

I don't consider what the Senate adopted and what I am recommending and what I hope will pass on maybe not a unanimous basis but on a bipartisan basis today, I don't see this as price controls. I see this as the Federal Government having a right to make a contract with drug companies, just like the VA does that every day, as the gentleman knows. It says to the drug companies, if you want to sell us drugs at the Veterans' Administration, we would like to buy them, but we are going to require a 30 to 40 percent discount on those drugs.

One might make the argument that doing that hurts the profits of the drug companies, and therefore, they cannot invest in new drugs. I don't think the present policy of the Veterans' Administration saving hundreds of millions of dollars by negotiating, not price controls, negotiating reasonably discounted prices for drugs when you are representing millions of consumers, in this case veterans, I don't think that has hurt the drug companies. In fact, it looks to me as if they welcome the opportunity to sell millions of dollars of drugs every year to the Veterans' Administration.

I am saying, we should apply that principle not to some other unrelated agency but rather to the Department of Defense. It is the Veterans Secretary, the VA Secretary, that has said in the past, in his judgment, the 1992 law, in the VA's opinion, allowed discounted drugs at pharmacies, but it is the pharmaceutical manufacturers who have filed the lawsuits to stop this from happening.

I respect the gentleman greatly. I don't challenge, not for a second, his motivations. We ought to be concerned about the formulary prices staying low for veterans. I just don't see helping military retirees who have served our country for 20 to 30 years, some of them for more than 30 years, letting them go to local pharmacists and get a discounted drug price rather than paying full retail value is really going to hurt veterans.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BUYER. I follow the logic of your argument until you say it is going to help the military retirees because

the military retirees don't get a specific benefit.

I concur with you when you say, Steve, let DOD gain access to FSS pricing, let them get their rebates. I get DOD savings, and with those savings, I can buy equipment and other things. That's your argument.

To say it is going to help the military retirees gain access through the formulary to lower drug prices is not true.

Mr. EDWARDS. Let me address why I respectfully disagree with the gentleman and why I think it is true.

I am the ranking member, as the gentleman knows, of the Military Quality of Life and Veterans' Affairs Appropriations Subcommittee in the House. Because of the budget limitations and the cost of Department of Defense and TRICARE programs this year, the House passed a bill that cuts about \$730 million out of the President's request for DOD and TRICARE health care programs. We have to make up that hole somehow. By saving \$250 million this year through this motion, if the House and Senate conferees agree to it, we help plug a large part of that huge hole. If we don't plug that hole, we are going to have to cut health care services for military retirees and possibly, I hope we would not, but possibly even active duty service men and women.

So this does help the military retirees. It helps us maintain the present level of health care services under TRICARE and gives them access to their local pharmacist, which many military retirees prefer. They trust their local pharmacist. They would prefer to go to that person and get advice and buy the discounted drugs under TRICARE.

It helps us have a chance to get rid of the 100 percent increase in copays for military retirees. I think this motion, if adopted into the bill, would help military retirees very significantly.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to Mr. BUYER.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. EDWARDS for yielding to me and having this conversation. This is important.

Members are going to be walking in here, Mr. EDWARDS, and they are not going to know completely what happened with this debate. It would not be right for Members to walk in here and think I will vote for Mr. EDWARDS' motion to instruct because I will help a military retiree lower his drug cost when he goes to the retail pharmacy. That is just not true. So I want the offices that are listening to this debate to understand that.

My greatest concern is opening up the Federal Supply Schedule. So I do not want to open up the Federal Supply Schedule to other departments or agencies of government, whether it is DOD, whether it is the Medicare or Medicaid program, and we can debate each of those. We might disagree on

things. That is the only point I wanted to make.

The plausible arguments in defense of your motion, I disagree with what you are trying to do here today, and I just wanted to make sure that I made that point.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me just point out something here today. I think we have seen something we rarely see on this floor with Mr. EDWARDS and Mr. BUYER; we have seen an actual discussion of the issue where we actually debate the issue, and on both sides, you have intelligent comments being made rather than people getting up and reading a statement and talking past each other. I just want to commend both of these gentlemen for the quality of debate that we have just heard on the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) for the comment about the debate. I think these are the kinds of issues we ought to debate. I welcome this kind of debate and honest differences of opinion. That is part of my criticism of the congressional process these days. It seems like so many times decisions get made behind closed doors, and the public does not know how those decisions are made. I think this is a healthy debate.

Despite my great respect for Mr. BUYER, I think this motion, if adopted into the final Defense bill for fiscal year 2007, would benefit hundreds and hundreds of thousands of our military retirees by letting them have access to low-priced prescription drugs at their local pharmacy by perhaps allowing us not to follow through with what I think is an unfair proposal from the House to double, to increase by 100 percent the copays that our military retirees pay for their drugs. We are not asking Members of Congress to double our copays for our prescription drugs this year during a time of war. I don't think we should ask our military retirees, many who have served 20 or 30 years in the military, to have an increase in copay for their drugs. We are not willing to ask ourselves to do that.

I think this is a beneficial motion. I believe it will be accepted with, not unanimous support, but with bipartisan support.

The only caution I want to urge, the good advice of my Texas colleague, mentioned by my friend from Colorado, when you have hit oil, you can stop drilling. I think the real test of whether we have hit oil or whether we have hit a dry hole is whether the language adopted already by the Senate, the language we will hopefully support on a bipartisan basis today on my motion, actually gets put in the final defense authorization bill.

I would issue a warning that oftentimes we pass motions to instruct conferees on an overwhelming basis if not

unanimous basis in this House, and somehow, behind closed doors, the interest of those we care about, in this case the interest of military retirees, seems to somehow not be considered as carefully as the interest of other special interests.

I think this is a good motion. I know the pharmaceutical companies have filed lawsuits to stop the discount pricing of drugs at retail pharmacies. They have a right to do that. Congress has the right and the responsibility today to say that, in 1992, we made a decision saying that our retirees ought to have access to discounted drugs at pharmacists as well as via mail order.

I urge bipartisan support of this motion to instruct. Unless the gentleman from Indiana wants to continue an honest debate, I would yield back.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I only wanted to respond to Mr. EDWARDS' comments that he understands there is a lawsuit because the drug companies do not want to give discounts on their drugs to the retail pharmacies, paraphrasing what I believe you said. That is not what the lawsuit is. That is not what the lawsuit is about.

What the lawsuit is about, as I understand this, is that DOD created a virtual depot, and they created this virtual depot or warehouse because they had no authority under the statutes to do this. They needed to create a warehouse so they could obtain access to rebates that are being done out in the private sector. So it was clever. It was smart and clever, but they had no authority to do this.

I warned DOD, and I spoke to Dr. Winkenwerder. I said, please don't do this. If you do this, there are going to be lawsuits because you have no authority to do this at all. He felt that he did. That is what the lawsuit is about.

Mr. EDWARDS. I appreciate the gentleman's comments. Just to summarize, the Military Officers Association of America urges support for this change in the law. If the drug manufacturers would like to join with military retirees and the largest organization in America representing those retirees, I would welcome that support.

I urge bipartisan support for this motion to instruct conferees on the Defense authorization bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I want to commend Mr. BUYER and Mr. EDWARDS on their sincere concern for the welfare of our veterans. They see things differently on this particular issue, but that doesn't take away from the concern that both have. They are good friends, and I know where their heart is on this, and it is in the right place.

As I said earlier, we have had the kind of debate I wish we could have

more often here in the House of Representatives.

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support the Motion to Instruct Conferees on H.R. 5122, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007.

The motion to instruct offered by my colleague, Representative CHET EDWARDS, would instruct House conferees to insist on Senate-passed language regarding the TRICARE retail pharmacy program. That language would allow TRICARE beneficiaries to purchase prescriptions from their local pharmacies at the same cost as through mail-order services, ensuring that our veterans and military retirees are not forced to pay more merely to visit their neighborhood drug store.

The Veterans Health Care Act of 1992 requires drug manufacturers to grant a Federal pricing discount on all drugs provided to the Department of Defense, Veterans' Administration, the Public Health Service and the Coast Guard. Unfortunately, not all drug manufacturers grant this discount on drugs provided to retail pharmacy stores, instead only applying the discount to mail-order prescriptions.

It is understandable that the Department of Defense would want to contain growing prescription drug costs. However, forcing TRICARE beneficiaries to obtain prescriptions by mail-order is not the solution—rather, we need to clarify that drug manufacturers must provide Federal pricing for all medications dispensed through the TRICARE retail pharmacy network. Section 721 of the Senate version of the Defense Authorization bill would do just this.

Representatives of the Department of Defense have acknowledged that Federal pricing for pharmaceuticals dispensed through the TRICARE retail pharmacy network would “significantly” contain growing prescription drug costs. It has been estimated that if the Senate provision is enacted, it could save taxpayers up to \$251 million in fiscal year 2007, and more than \$300 million annually by fiscal year 2009, by requiring Federal pricing discounts to be applied to these TRICARE retail pharmacies.

I have heard serious concerns expressed by veterans and military retirees in my district about this issue many times this summer. There are times when it is not possible to wait for a mail order to come before a person might need to begin taking their prescriptions. In those cases, for example, the men and women who have bravely served our country should not be punished for buying their prescriptions down the block. Our veterans, military retirees and their families deserve to have the option to use a pharmacy, and the services of a pharmacist, when they have questions regarding their prescriptions and their health. Passing this motion to instruct allows them that option.

We must ensure that our veterans and military retirees receive the benefits they have so courageously earned, and this motion to instruct will help guarantee they are not penalized for doing so. I support this motion to instruct, and strongly urge my colleagues to do as well.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2066. An act to amend title 40, United States Code, to establish a Federal Acquisition Service, to replace the General Supply Fund and the Information Technology Fund with an Acquisition Services Fund, and for other purposes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 503, and to insert extraneous material on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

AMERICAN HORSE SLAUGHTER PREVENTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 981 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 503.

□ 1200

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 503) to amend the Horse Protection Act to prohibit the shipping, transporting, moving, delivering, receiving, possessing, purchasing, selling, or donation of horses and other equines to be slaughtered for human consumption, and for other purposes, with Mr. PUTNAM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

As designees of the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON), the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY) each will control 10 minutes.

As designees of the minority leader, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I know that H.R. 503 is an emotional issue for many people. It is my hope that this debate will give us a chance to look beyond the emotion and actually explore the facts of the issue in this particular bill. It is important that this discussion be fair, that it be open; and to that end the committee that I chair, the Energy and Commerce Committee, held a hearing a month ago that included witnesses from both sides and was fair and balanced. We put together a completely balanced hearing; and at the end of that hearing, it was clear to me that the majority of the experts have spoken, and they have spoken that H.R. 503 is bad policy and that it is bad for horses.

It is not a secret that I am opposed to the bill in its current form. Despite what may have been said, it is not because I do not like horses. It is not because I had some bad experience when I was young. In fact, I had and continue to have very positive experiences with horses. My opposition to this bill stems from the simple fact that it comes with negative consequences that I believe are being overlooked.

Ever since the bill has been introduced, I have been bombarded by calls, letters, and meeting requests from people both in my district and all over the country on both sides of the issue. I have heard from ranchers and horse owners as well as the American Quarter Horse Association, the American Veterinary Medical Association, the American Association of Equine Practitioners, American Farm Bureau, National Cattlemen's Beef Association, the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association. The list goes on and on. I have also been approached by proponents of the bill that are very supportive and very emotionally and strongly attached to this particular bill. Unfortunately for those folks, I must say that I am opposed to the bill because the majority of the evidence is that it is a bad bill. In fact, over 200 national organizations oppose the bill. Yesterday, even the United States Department of Agriculture came out in opposition to the bill. These are groups that, frankly, I consider to be representative of rural America, and they have all said the same thing: H.R. 503 will lead to a miserable existence for thousands of horses and is an outright attack at animal agriculture.

The care and the overall health of the animals, and notably the rights of their owners, should always be the primary concern when taking up legislation of this nature. Processing unmanageable and unwanted horses provides a humane alternative to continuing a

life of discomfort, inadequate care, or possibly even abandonment for thousands of horses.

Mandatory United States Department of Agriculture inspection, which abides by strict laws monitoring the welfare of animals in the processing facility, assures that horses that are going to slaughter are treated humanely. It is also important to note that since last year's agriculture appropriations bill was enacted, the three American processing plants pay for those inspectors out of their own pockets. No expense to the taxpayer.

I might say on this note that the proponents of the bill have said repeatedly that the Cattlemen's Association gets \$3 for every horse that is taken to slaughter. That is a true statement. But the reason that \$3 is paid is because it is the Cattlemen's Association, at least in Texas, that is actually paying for the inspectors to inspect the horses that are brought to the slaughterhouse in Texas. So that is why you have the \$3-per-horse fee. It is because in last year's agriculture appropriations bill, we said that those inspectors could not be paid for with Federal funds; therefore, an arrangement has been made between the slaughterhouses in Texas and the Cattlemen's Association that the inspectors will be paid for by providing this fee to the Cattlemen's Association that pays the inspectors.

H.R. 503 provides no alternative for thousands of horse owners for whom continued care of an animal is no longer economical or in some cases humane.

The other concern the bill raises for me is one of private property rights. While a majority of my constituents live in the Arlington/Fort Worth area down in Texas, the geography of the district that I represent is almost entirely rural. Animal agriculture is a large part of the economy for much of my district, and agriculture is already one of the most extensively regulated industries in the United States of America.

In the name of animal welfare, the United States Department of Agriculture right now tells owners how they can and cannot transport their animals. In the name of consumer safety, the United States Department of Agriculture right now tells them what they can and cannot feed their animals. This bill would tell producers to whom they can and cannot sell their horses. As a long-time proponent of limited government, I take issue with this last statement.

The horse owners in question have fed, housed, and cared for their animals, in some cases for decades, at great personal expense. When an animal reaches the point when he or she is no longer productive for the owner, who are we then to deny an owner the opportunity to recover some small portion of their costs that they have incurred in caring for the animal so far in its life? Why should they not be al-

lowed to sell their animal to a legal, humane, and closely regulated processing facility?

Now, I understand that there are many groups that strongly support this particular bill and some of the thoroughbred associations are strongly in support of H.R. 503. If they have the money to pay for their horses, if they have the money to take care of their horses, that is fine. They do not have to take them to a slaughterhouse. That is freedom of choice. But for many ordinary Americans who do not have the resources that some of the more well-heeled thoroughbred associations and horse farms have, I think having a slaughterhouse option is a humane option.

Again, I understand that this is an emotional issue for many people. But I do not think Congress should vote purely on emotion. I think there should be common sense brought into the equation. And when you really look at the bill in that light, the obvious vote, at least for me, is a "no" vote.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. OTTER) and ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control that time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho will control the remainder of the time at the designation of the majority leader.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 503, the American Horse Slaughter Prevention Act, which would put an end to the deplorable practice of slaughtering American horses for consumption.

As a strong supporter of animal rights, a horse lover, a former horse owner, I have joined with 202 of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle as a cosponsor of H.R. 503. 550 national and State organizations also support H.R. 503, and I have received over 900 communications from constituents in support of the bill.

Congress has already expressed its desire to put an end to horse slaughter by voting to amend the fiscal year 2006 agriculture appropriations bill to ban the practice. That amendment passed by an overwhelming vote of 269-158 in the House, 69-28 in the Senate. However, the language that passed in both the House and Senate stating that no Federal dollars could be used to fund the inspection of horse slaughter plants, thus ending the practice, was stripped out. The Republican leadership, in an act of hubris, changed the language in conference to allow for flexibility in interpretation of that ban and allowed the plants to continue to operate. This is going against congressional intent and has been taken to the courts.

Congress voted to put an end to horse slaughter in this country because horses are some of the most beautiful and beloved domesticated animals on Earth. Earlier this year the story of

Barbaro, the Kentucky Derby winner that shattered his leg at the start of the Preakness, transfixed millions of Americans. Since his injury, the thoroughbred has received an incredible outpouring of letters, flowers, apples, and carrots from Americans across the country. Fans have even made pilgrimages to Barbaro's care facility in Pennsylvania to wish him well in his long recovery. Americans are rooting for Barbaro because they have been inspired by his strength, his beauty, and his strong personality.

Americans have long appreciated horses for transport, on ranches, as police mounts, and as cherished companions. The American Horse Council reports that 1.9 million Americans currently own horses. Another 7.1 million Americans are involved in the industry as horse owners, service providers, employees, and volunteers, while tens of millions participate in horse events as spectators. These millions of Americans know that horses should be treated with dignity and respect in life and death. They are disgusted, as I am, that in 2005 over 90,000 horses were slaughtered at three American-based foreign-owned plants, and I stress foreign-owned plants, so that meat could be shipped to Europe and Asia for consumption as a delicacy.

Horses bound for slaughter must endure inhumane conditions on the way to and during slaughter. Horses are shipped frequently for long distances in terrible conditions. They are crammed together in trucks built for cattle and pigs. Because of the cramped transport, they are often trampled and some horses arrive at the slaughterhouse seriously injured or dead. Once at the slaughterhouse, horses are often not rendered unconscious before they are killed, as mandated by Federal law.

Most people assume that all or most of the horses bought for slaughter are old or injured. In fact, according to the USDA guidelines for handling and transporting equines for slaughter, 92.3 percent of horses that arrive at slaughter plants are in "good" condition, meaning they are not injured, lame, overweight, or underweight. Healthy animals, pets, and former race horses are all sent to slaughter.

We may hear today that it is likened to being humane to animals in order to oppose this legislation. It could not be further from the truth. The humane vote is to vote in favor of this legislation to ban the inhumane slaughter of horses.

Earlier I mentioned Barbaro, the Kentucky Derby winner. Ferdinand, the winner of the 1986 Derby, faced a very different fate. After his momentous Derby victory, Ferdinand was killed for food in a Japanese slaughterhouse in 2002. Just imagine if Barbaro faced the same end.

Not surprisingly, a recent poll conducted by public opinion strategists found that 65 percent of Americans do not support horse slaughter, and 64 percent of Americans believe that horses

are companions like dogs and cats and killing a horse to eat is not different than killing a cat or dog to eat.

I am sure that other Members of this body have received hundreds of letters too from constituents who oppose horse slaughter and support H.R. 503. I think it is time to listen to the American public and finally end the barbaric practice of horse slaughter by passing H.R. 503. Let us not sign off on Barbaro burgers.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 503.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OTTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I submit for the RECORD an editorial from the Dallas Morning News and also an editorial from the Star-Telegram.

A HUMANE END: SLAUGHTER PREVENTS WIDER SUFFERING

[From the Dallas Morning News, Sept. 7, 2006]

Few issues roil the emotions more than those involving the dependent and helpless. Hence, the turbulent debate over a proposal in Congress to end the legal slaughter of horses that feed overseas meat markets.

It's not right to dismiss or belittle the strongly held beliefs of animal advocates on the matter. They argue that the horse is a loyal service and companion animal that should not end up on someone's dinner table. Indeed, most Americans' sensibilities align with that view.

But the grisly alternative to humane slaughter is a slow, painful end for tens of thousands of castoff animals every year.

In a poignant irony, major veterinary groups are lined up against a slaughter ban. They argue persuasively that enough buyers or adoptive homes couldn't be found for all horses deemed too old, unfit or expensive by their owners.

Maintaining a horse for its natural life can exceed \$25,000, even short of veterinary care.

The federal government, despite help from rescue organizations, already fails to find homes for thousands of wild horses culled each year from herds roaming national grasslands. Think of boosting the number of unwanted animals by the 60,000 to 100,000 horses that now go to slaughter annually. That would recklessly invite widespread abandonment and starvation.

Two of the nation's three horse slaughterhouses are in North Texas, the foreign-owned Dallas Crown in Kaufman and Beltex in Fort Worth. It's a closely regulated business aimed at humane treatment, from transport to euthanasia.

Some slaughter opponents say a better end for unwanted horses would be veterinarian-administered euthanasia. That position ignores the pivotal issue of added cost for rendering, incineration or burial.

Exported horse meat heads primarily to Europe and Asia, where no cultural taboo is attached to consumption. Top consumers are mostly developing nations with a need for added protein in the diet. Thus, the slaughtered horse makes a final contribution to the cycle of life.

In this country, at least, the law seeks to guarantee a humane end, in keeping with the horse's honored place in national lore. Congress should devote its energies toward keeping things that way, thus avoiding the unwanted consequence of needless suffering.

[From the Star-Telegram, Sept. 1, 2006]

SIRING PROBLEMS

The federal bill grabbing the attention of horse lovers and animal rights activists bans

the "shipping, transporting, moving, delivering, receiving, possessing, purchasing, selling, or donation of horses and other equines to be slaughtered for human consumption, and for other purposes."

The "other purposes" aren't outlined in HR 503, which is scheduled for a House vote on Thursday, but the result of this bill's passage would be to shut down an industry that provides a practical public service: disposal of the remains of dead horses.

It must be acknowledged up front that lots of Americans will never be convinced that allowing the slaughter of horses for sale as meat—for carnivores in zoos, canines at home or connoisseurs in Cannes—is a public service.

To some people, horses are more than "mere property," as Wayne Pacelle, president and CEO of the American Humane Society, wrote in an Aug. 23 guest column. But as horse breeder Jay Novacek rightly pointed out in the Aug. 21 column that triggered Pacelle's response, not all horses are pets, and not every horse owner has the financial resources to keep a horse until it dies of natural causes and then pay to bury or burn the carcass.

Maintaining a horse until its natural death averages \$25,740 per animal, not including veterinary care for sickness or injury, according to a June report (commissioned by the Animal Welfare Council) about the consequences of a horse slaughter ban. The average lifespan of a horse is 20 to 25 years.

Pacelle is correct in that before Americans had trucks and cars to deliver the mail and packages, horses were the common mode of transportation. They were work animals. But romanticizing those relationships as something other than people appreciating the tools they needed to do their jobs is an attempt to play every emotional note possible.

Harkening back to a time when "almost everyone knew how to ride a horse" reveals a nostalgia for a day when people had few alternative forms of transportation other than their own two feet. Pardon us for saying that we aren't anxious to return to that chapter in history.

One can respect and be grateful for the horse's role in U.S. history without ignoring the pragmatic problems of what to do with a dead or unwanted one.

Shuttering the Beltex processing plant in Fort Worth won't put an end to "grim news" for the estimated 70,000 to 100,000 American horses that are slaughtered annually unless there's some way to cheat death for four-legged animals, or a pipeline to 70,000 to 100,000 people financially capable of caring for these animals.

No matter how much their owners appreciate them, horses get old and sick, and they die. Something has to be done with the carcass. And the affordable "something" for tens of thousands of people is the slaughterhouse. Incineration can cost as much as \$2,000, and lots of areas have ordinances that make it illegal to bury Flicka in the back 40.

If public health, humane treatment or nuisance issues are discovered relating to the three horse processing plants operating in the United States (two of them in Texas), it's totally appropriate for government to address them. But U.S. history books are rife with examples of bad laws resulting from emotional appeals.

If passed, HR 503 will not save one horse's life, nor will it do anything to guarantee humane treatment for the animals.

Mr. OTTER. Mr. Chairman, the House of Representatives is voting today on an amendment to the Horse Protection Act that actually would irresponsibly endanger the welfare of the

very animal that it purports to help. I oppose H.R. 503, which is driven by raw emotion and misinformation rather than by the facts. By eliminating the option of humane slaughter of the horses, the bill provides no directive as to what will happen to the 90,000 unwanted horses annually processed in our slaughter facilities. It increases the probability of unwanted horses becoming the victims of neglect, starvation, or abandonment. It criminalizes a legitimate and legal U.S. industry. It eliminates hundreds of U.S. jobs. It mandates costs estimated at \$3 billion to \$4 billion on private citizens. And it creates far more problems than it actually solves.

□ 1215

It limits horse owners' choices for disposing of their animals, and it infringes on the owners' private property rights. Private property rights have long been held dear by the families and the land owners in the west, and for good reason. Their farms and ranches have been their livelihood and part of their national heritage since the frontier was closed and the west was settled.

Not many months ago, many of my colleagues, most of those who are on the opposition side of this bill, on a bipartisan basis, rose in indignation at the Kelo v. New London, Connecticut, the City of New London, Connecticut decision, because it was taking private property rights.

I have stood many times with many of those folks who are now proponents of this bill to protect intellectual private property rights. I see no difference. And like it or not, a horse is private property. They are not humans. They must be treated humanely and cared for appropriately. However, when a horse is no longer wanted or cannot be cared for, Congress should not be in the business of deciding how the animals can or cannot be disposed of.

We fight for the protection of personal property rights and intellectual property rights, everything from dirt to ideas, Mr. Chairman. This is no different. I strongly encourage Members to oppose this misguided effort and continue preserving a strong tradition of private personal property rights in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to this bill that is before us. When we all look at all of the important issues waiting for Congress to act on, I cannot understand why we are here wasting so much of our time on an issue that really has nothing to do with the pressing problems that are facing people in this country.

But here we are today considering a bill that would effectively shut down three horse-processing facilities and

eliminate a reasonable option for horse owners who can no longer afford to care for their animals that are no longer productive.

I understand that this issue is an emotional one for many people. But what other options are there for people who own aging horses that are no longer productive? It costs anywhere from, people tell me, \$1,200 to \$1,800 a year, some people say \$2,300 a year. That is a lot of money for most people to care for an animal that has outlived its productive years.

Some of these aging horses are sent to horse rescue facilities. While those facilities can provide a good home for aging horses, there are no Federal guarantees or standards of care that must be met. There is no guarantee that the horses at these facilities will be treated humanely. And this bill does not provide any money to help rescue facilities cover the additional costs that they will incur, and there is no way that we can accommodate all of the horses that will be abandoned if we pass this bill.

While H.R. 503 outlaws slaughter for human consumption, the bill does not prohibit horses from being killed. Some supporters of this bill support euthanasia as an alternative to processing. However, euthanizing a horse is not cheap; it can cost anywhere from \$300 to \$2,000 an animal depending on the local rules for carcass disposal.

Processing provides a cost effective and a humane alternative to neglect and abandonment when horse owners are unable to find another buyer. Caring for a horse properly is expensive, and it is time consuming. The real question of animal welfare lies in what will happen if the slaughter ban is imposed. These unwanted horses are often sick, unfit or problem animals. Many of them are already living in pain or discomfort, and tens of thousands more could be neglected, starved or abandoned if their owners no longer have processing available as an end-of-life option.

If we pass this bill, we will ignore the fate of these animals who find their lives extended but without the necessary standards of care that they need and deserve. So at the end of the day, this bill is not about protecting horses from an untimely death; all it will do is limit the option of horse owners and burden them with additional costs of care and disposal.

The House Agriculture Committee recognized the many weaknesses in this bill and voted to recommend that the House not pass this bill by a vote of 37-3.

The Members of our committee represent agricultural areas around the country, areas where people own and use horses every day. We passed several amendments to this bill during our committee mark-up, but they are not included in the bill that we are considering here today.

This shows a complete lack of respect for the expertise and the effort that the

Agriculture Committee has contributed to this subject. At the end of the day, this debate is about defining what is humane when we are dealing with unwanted horses. Are we going to pass legislation that truly addresses the health and well being of animals, or are we going to pursue bills that amount to little more than window dressing in the name of animal welfare?

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to set aside this emotionally charged issue and oppose this legislation that will tie the hands of horse owners around this country.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, some of us were late coming to the floor. I would like an explanation of the division of the time on this debate.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 981, as designees of the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON), the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY) each were allocated 10 minutes.

As designees of the minority leader, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) each will control 20 minutes.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, what is the time remaining on this side of the aisle at this point?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) has 10 minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY) has 10 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mr. WHITFIELD. He has 10½ minutes because time was yielded to him.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct. The majority leader reallocated time.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, today we are going to have a serious discussion that in my estimation is long overdue. Since 1979, Members of Congress, with the vast and substantial support of the American people, have tried to have this issue resolved.

What I speak of is H.R. 503, the American Horse Slaughter Prevention Act. Mr. PETERSON, my good friend, made what I think is one point I will agree with him on. This is a debate about what is humane. And despite the words and the rhetoric of the opponents of this legislation, the focus should be on the issue of what is humane and what the will of the people are, because what we are exposing today is a brutal, shadowy, shameful, predatory practice that borders on the perverse.

Public opinion, as I said, is substantially in support. Every poll that I

have seen, 70 percent of the American people want this practice banned and stopped, the practice of horse slaughter for human consumption, something culturally the United States has never accepted nor have any of the Indian territories within the United States.

Editorials were recited a bit earlier, but I will give you some editorials. Today the Washington Post, with a diametrically different view of the world than the Washington Times, both editorialized saying that this practice should end. It reflects on our culture. It reflects on our priorities inappropriately and improperly.

In California, a referendum was passed with 60 percent of the vote saying that that practice should be banned in California. And there is Texas law, and many other States have laws that ban the practice. What H.R. 503 does is it prohibits the shipping, the transporting, the moving, the delivering, the receiving, the purchasing, selling or donation of horses and other equines for slaughter for human consumption.

What I really want to emphasize though is what this practice is. The opponents have said this is a humane process. The opponents have said that this is going to limit individuals' rights and individuals' property rights, none of that being true.

What this is going to do is stop a practice that, first of all, is in violation of many State laws and, secondly, is not adhered to or supported by substantial populations, and it is brutal.

This picture here, this is a horse's head. This is a horse's head that was discovered in transport to one of the slaughter houses. What we have here are three slaughter house factories, two in Texas, one in Illinois, both operating with substantial local opposition and presenting substantial environmental and economic problems to those communities.

What we have are horses from all over the country, thousands of miles away, transported in cramped cattle or pig trailers or trucks. Not designed or built for horses, not designed to transport horses. They are often purchased in a predatory fashion by killer-buyers who do not disclose what the purpose of their purchase is going to be, who, as I said, operate in a shadowy way.

They bring these beautiful animals those thousands of miles in these cramped conditions with all different types of horses cramped in, despite USDA regulations that say you cannot transport them that way. The irony, Mr. Chairman, is on the day the Agriculture Committee marked up its bill, a bill which the amendments will be to the floor in a little while, all meant to continue that practice, to kill H.R. 503; on the very day they were marking up that bill, an arrest was made in Mississippi of one of those predatory killer-buyers who had 20-25 horses in his care. He stopped because he got a flat tire. And the owner of the service station he stopped at saw the condition, the condition of these animals, and

called the police, thus allowing us to finally enforce the law.

Mr. Chairman, we need to pass this bill because USDA has not done their job. In fact, they have been on the other side of the issue consistently. They surreptitiously overturned Congressional action last year. Ms. SCHAKOWSKY pointed that out earlier. We need to bring an end to this practice because it says too much about us.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman has 15 minutes remaining.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I am an original cosponsor of this bill, along with Mr. WHITFIELD and Mr. SWEENEY. This bill is to prevent the violent practice of slaughtering horses for human consumption. Why are we offering it?

If you have grown up with horses, you know why we are offering it. They are as close to human as any animal you can get. Why are we offering it? Because there are three foreign-owned slaughter houses, just three, in the United States where these horses are slaughtered, various means, jacking them up by their hind legs, slitting their throats.

Why does this practice continue? So that these slaughter houses can keep a steady flow of horse meat to the dinner tables and meat markets, not in the United States, but of Asia and Europe where horse meat is still eaten. Americans do not even eat horse meat.

The Horse Slaughter Prevention Act before us today, if passed into law, will simply end this practice once and for all across the entire United States.

The opponents of this bill have come up with a number of objections, reasons they think it is a bad idea. First of all, they would have us believe that this is a first step down a slippery slope. That next will come cows and then hogs and then chickens and then other animals consumed by Americans.

But the Horse Slaughter Prevention Act does nothing of the kind, and it will not lead in that direction, because horses are unique and distinct. We all know that.

Second, the opponents claim that banning horse slaughter will result in an overpopulation of horses in this country. Once again, this is not true. There are currently three slaughter houses in the United States in two States. In five States, including California, a law banning horse slaughter has been in effect for 7 years. What has been the effect? There have been no effects. There have not been animals that are left derelict. There haven't been animals that are not buried. There have not been too few euthanasias.

Practically speaking, in all five States where this law is already the

law of the land, there has been no effect whatsoever.

Each year, about 90,000 horses are slaughtered. So there is no real impact in a country as large as the United States in the disposing of those 90,000 horses by means other than horse meat slaughtering.

Third and finally, our opponents have touted letters from cattlemen and chicken farmers and all sorts of livestock raisers who say they oppose the bill.

We have and we will gladly display to anyone who wants to see it a seven-page memorandum, single spaced, of supporters all over the country who know horses, who love horses; they are horse raisers, horse racers, horse lovers, you name it. Everybody has signed on to this saying it is time we do something like this.

□ 1230

Last year, when it appeared that the Horse Slaughter Prevention Act would never get its day on the House floor, Mr. SWEENEY and Mr. WHITFIELD and I offered an amendment to the House appropriations bill to ban Federal funding to facilitate horse slaughter for 1 year. That amendment drew 269 votes in support; 269 Members passed it by a substantial majority. I hope that today my colleagues will remember the vote they cast last year and will see fit to end the brutal practice of killing horses and will vote not only for the bill but against all amendments because they would only debilitate and defeat the bill.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman and thank him for taking on this battle with others.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 503, the American Horse Slaughter Prevention Act. I oppose the cruel and senseless slaughter of American horses for human consumption in the United States or for foreign markets. I just think we should not be allowing this.

Last year, more than 90,000 American horses were either slaughtered in one of three foreign-owned slaughterhouses in the U.S. or shipped to Canada or Mexico for slaughter.

Horses have never been raised for human consumption in America. This slaughter is done for export.

Legislation is necessary because the Department of Agriculture is blatantly circumventing clear congressional intent on horse slaughter in last year's fiscal year 2006 Agriculture Appropriations Act.

This legislation would prohibit the transportation, possession and sale of horses to be slaughtered for human consumption in the U.S. It does not remove the rights of owners to do what they want with their horses.

Under H.R. 503, owners can humanely euthanize sick, dangerous, or old horses. Horses can continue to be kept by their owners, can be sold to a new

home, or placed in one of the many horse sanctuaries located across the country.

The way a society treats its animals, particularly horses, speaks to the core values and priorities of its citizens. Horses are not just companions and recreational animals. They are a vital part of our Nation's culture and history.

I urge my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation and oppose all amendments aimed to weaken it.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR), a real rancher, horse owner and outstanding member of the House Agriculture Committee.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota.

I have been a farmer and rancher all of my life, still live on the original family farmstead that my great great grandfather settled back in 1860. Horses have been a real part of the way we do business on the Salazar ranch. As a matter of fact, we still use horses to round up cattle and move them from pasture to pasture.

I know that H.R. 503 is a well-intended act, but if it becomes law, it will have very poor results.

The act will seriously, in my opinion, compromise horse welfare. Under this bill, care must be potentially provided for the additional 90,000 horses that are going to be out there annually.

It will eliminate a humane end-of-life option for horse owners and force them to send their horses out to already overcrowded rescue centers or sentence them to live out their final years in suffering.

Processing provides a cost-effective alternative to neglect and abandonment when horse owners are unable to find another buyer. It is not such a problem out in rural areas, but it is a major problem in urban areas.

In 2005 alone, it saved owners and rescue facilities an estimated \$220 million in total costs of caring for unwanted horses.

The Animal Welfare council estimated that cumulative annual maintenance costs of otherwise processed horses since the year 2000 would have exceeded more than \$513 million in 2005. It would cost \$1,900 per year to house each unwanted and abandoned horse, not including veterinary or farrier services. It will cost \$127 million in the first year to properly care for these animals if this legislation is enacted.

Who will pay for this cost? You will pay for the cost in the end. These facilities do not receive public money at the moment; but I can assure you that if these horses become a nuisance, you, the taxpayer, will end up paying for their care.

H.R. 503 does not specify who will bear the costs of the ban if this ban is

implemented. What will happen to the management tools the Bureau of Land Management has to manage the wildlife of wild horse bans out in the western United States? If this bill is enacted, none of these horses who are unwanted, and although BLM does try to auction them off or to give them to pet owners, what will happen to those horses? What will happen when I am out riding, rounding up my cattle and my horse falls into a prairie dog hole and breaks his leg? Will I then not be able to send him to some rendering facility? What will happen or what is the next step? Will people take away our right to be able to go out and hunt elk? Is that the next step?

I know that H.R. 503 is a well-intended act, but it will have very serious consequences on our agricultural community. I would urge my colleagues to oppose the ban of horse slaughter and to vote "no" on H.R. 503.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the words of my colleague and his sentiments, and I need to make a couple of points because there is a substantial skewing of the record here.

First of all, in 1989, 350-some-odd thousand horses were slaughtered. We have that number down to below 90,000. That is 1 percent of the horse population that is put down every year.

Secondly, the gentleman says that this will preclude an option for putting down his horse if his horse becomes lame. I would make two points. One is that 90-plus percent of the horses that are sent to slaughter facilities are rated by the USDA as being healthy and strong and fit animals.

So this is not about putting down animals, and if you have that problem, there still are humane procedures. You can go to a local vet and have your local vet for \$50 to \$250 oversee the process of putting your animal down.

Frankly, this bill does not stop an owner from putting a horse down themselves by any means.

This bill prohibits the public transportation of that. This bill prohibits the slaughter for human consumption at these three facilities.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWEENEY. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. Chairman, I have been around horses all of my entire life. Do you consider the slaughtering of animals such as beef inhumane?

Mr. SWEENEY. This is not about that. This is about horses which are in a special place. This is about a practice that is profusely out of whack with the standards of America.

Reclaiming my time, I want to talk about the slaughter facilities themselves. These houses do not contribute to this economy. In his written testimony during the committee hearings on H.R. 503, Dick Koehler, vice president of Beltex Corp., a slaughter plant

in Fort Worth, Texas, described the horse slaughter industry as a tax-paying legitimate business. Yet witnesses at that same hearing revealed tax returns showing that Dallas Crown, Inc., based in Kaufman, Texas, made \$12 million in revenue 1 year and paid only \$5 in U.S. taxes.

The U.S. exports 18,000 tons of horse meat, netting \$65 million in 2005; and the profits went back to the countries of the owners of those plants. Two of them are from Belgium. One of them is from France.

There are costs to the local economies. It is a practice that is abhorrent and that is not supported.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve my time.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

(Mrs. MALONEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 503; and like many of my colleagues, I have been around horses all my life. I am a former horse owner and my father had a farm. The humane vote is to vote "yes" on H.R. 503.

I thank my colleagues, Mr. SWEENEY and Mr. SPRATT and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, for their really outstanding leadership and for clarifying the points that have been so made in this debate.

Over 90,000 horses were brutally slaughtered last year at three foreign-owned slaughterhouses in the United States, and their meat was then shipped to countries in Europe and Asia for human consumption. Americans do not eat horse meat. They love horses. They are cherished companions. They are sporting animals. They are not food.

If you look at the history of America, horses have played such an important part in our Nation's development, and I would say they are probably the most beloved animals native to the United States.

The American people strongly support banning horse slaughter. They recognize that it is a deplorable practice that needs to end.

Over 70 percent have expressed this opinion in opposition to slaughtering horses for human consumption. Again, no American would eat horse meat. This is to be shipped to a foreign country, and they are slaughtered in a gruesome manner, as my colleague pointed out on the floor.

While it is technically required that horses be unconscious prior to slaughter, the method used to render them unconscious is not effective due to a horse's instinctive flight response to stress. As a result, the horses are sometimes conscious while being slaughtered. This is unconscionable.

I call upon my colleagues for a humane vote and to vote "yes" on this bill.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we are going to hear in a little while that there is substantial support in the ag community and other places, and I will grant that there is substantial opposition to this bill, as well as substantial support, within 500 horse organizations.

But what I find most sad and in a way ironic is that an organization like the American Veterinary Medical Association opposes this legislation when employees of a slaughter plant blatantly do not follow the AVMA procedure for slaughtering a horse.

Again, an important notion to understand is that slaughter is not the same as humane euthanasia by a qualified veterinarian. Euthanasia, according to AVMA, is an act of inducing humane death that is respectful and is painless and as distress free as possible.

Yet we saw in that picture, that was transport, that was not even slaughter. That was a horse in transport. Horses suffer horribly on the way to and during slaughter, where they often endure repeated blows to the head and upper body before being hoisted up for slaughter, sometimes still conscious. That is not euthanasia.

Slaughter is markedly different than acceptable forms of euthanasia. The AVMA requires that a captive bolt method must be administered by trained, skilled and monitored personnel and that the horse must be adequately restrained. These requirements are typically not met in equine slaughter plants, thus raising significant welfare concerns.

Let me say something about the plants, too. One of the issues raised is that you are going to shut these plants down and people are going to lose their jobs. We are talking about something in the range of 150 employees. To my friends on my side of the aisle who talk all the time about how we have got to be tough on immigration, I suggest to you that a substantial number of those workers are not in this country under legal means. They are low-level laborers. It is the only people they could find to do this.

I would also inform my colleagues that all three of these facilities, all three of these facilities operate and slaughter for other means, other livestock, and that they could simply go to that business. This is a practice that is not adhered to or supported.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

□ 1245

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

I would point out that the two largest horse associations in the United States, the American Quarter Horse Association and the American Paint Horse Association, are opposed to this bill, and they represent the biggest number of horse owners in the country. So people need to understand that.

I wondered if Mr. SWEENEY would yield on the points he was making. I wanted to ask him a question.

You know, you keep talking about the way they are treated as they are hauled to slaughter. As I understand it, in this bill, there are no requirements put on so that, if you are hauling these animals to a rescue facility, there is no regulation or any kind of requirements put on anybody to haul them to those rescue facilities. So what have you accomplished?

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SWEENEY. Well, there are requirements for the transport under USDA. The problem is USDA does not enforce those requirements.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 more minute.

But, you know, nothing will change under this bill.

Mr. SWEENEY. I would suggest, Mr. PETERSON, that people who are rescuing horses have a different mindset and intent than those who are slaughtering for human consumption.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. I am not sure that is the case, because you are going to have 90,000 horses, and you are going to have people rescuing them basically under duress because they are not going to know what to do with them.

In my part of the world, we already have people letting horses out, out in the country, just like dogs and cats, because we don't have a processing facility close enough to us. It is a huge problem.

Mr. SWEENEY. And 20 percent of the horse population, in reporting data out of California and everywhere else, suggests absolutely the opposite.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Well, they are hauling them to Texas because there is a processing facility.

The only point I am trying to make, Mr. Chairman, is that some of these issues they are claiming they are going to solve with this bill are not going to be solved. They are actually going to create more problems.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I am pleased to yield 2¼ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES), the chairman of the Livestock Subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 503. This is a bill that has tremendous shortcomings, will cause major negative disruptions throughout the horse industry and lacks any strategy of how to deal with the problems that it will undoubtedly create.

The bill is based on emotion. If you stop to think about what will happen to these 60,000 to 90,000 horses being diverted from processing each year, you will realize the bill does not provide a single answer to truly the problem.

I find it deeply troubling that the sponsors of H.R. 503 care more about what happens to the animal after it is

euthanized than what happens when it is alive. If these animals are no longer able to be processed at federally regulated plants, where will these horses go? Yes, these animals will be alive, but if it is a life of negative abuse, abandonment and starvation, what good have we served? We want to make sure all these animals are cared for humanely throughout their life.

Owning a horse is a privilege that should be taken seriously. Horses are high maintenance animals that require feed, water, veterinary care and safe-keeping. The care of horses is expensive. The Animal Welfare Council estimates it costs \$2,340 per year per horse. Public animal rescue facilities and horse sanctuaries across the country are currently saturated with unwanted horses and in desperate need of funds. Even the proponents of this bill have acknowledged this fact. How does adding thousands more horses help this already dismal situation?

H.R. 503 does not provide a single answer to ensure the proper care of these animals. Where will these animals go? How will we fund their care? How do we ensure they are not starved and abandoned? Why should we burden our local communities with problems created by this bill?

More than 200 reputable horse organizations, animal health organizations and agricultural organizations oppose this legislation, and they represent some of the most respected and knowledgeable people who own and care for horses in the United States. In my home State, the North Carolina Horse Council, Quarter Horse Association, the North Carolina Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services, the North Carolina Farm Bureau, the North Carolina Pork Council and the North Carolina Cattlemen's Association all oppose this legislation and the precedent it would set for other livestock.

If you look at the facts and not the emotional hype, I believe the choice here is really quite simple. My stand against H.R. 503 is a stand for the humane treatment of these animals. I urge my colleagues to do the right things for horses and horse owners. Vote "no" on H.R. 503.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I would like to yield 3 minutes to our distinguished whip, Mr. HOYER.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentlewoman. This is about politics not policy. The policy, I am going to support. This is about politics. It is about the election of one Member in a very hotly contested race in New York.

I hope the American public are tuned in. With all the pressing critical issues that confront our Nation, what is the one issue in the one-fifteenth of the session that we have left that we are according our time to? The Horse Slaughter Prevention Act. This is an important issue that should be considered. I do not mean to make light of the legislation. But is this the issue that the American people expect their elected representatives to be considering at this moment?

On Monday, we commemorate the fifth anniversary of the worst terrorist attack in our Nation's history. 9/11 is a day of remembrance and resolve, and it is also a time to recognize that we are not as safe as we should be. Apparently, horses aren't either. But people aren't as safe as they should be.

Just today, a former Republican Speaker of the House, Newt Gingrich, wrote, and I quote, "Five years have passed since the horrific attack on our homeland, and still there is one serious undeniable fact we have yet to confront. We are today," said the former Speaker, Newt Gingrich, "not where we wanted to be and nowhere near where we need to be."

Yet one-fifteenth of the time we have left before the election is spent on horses. Osama bin Laden is still on the loose. This Congress has failed to enact the 9/11 Commission's recommendations. The nuclear threat from North Korea and Iran has increased. Afghanistan is backsliding, and Iraq simmers in a low-grade civil war, yet we are focused on this act.

Last week, I joined more than 20 of my Democratic colleagues in visiting New Orleans and the gulf coast, areas devastated by Hurricane Katrina 1 year ago. We observed incredible courage and optimism on the part of the citizens there, but we all saw an area that is still a shell of its former self.

In New Orleans, nearly 60 percent of homes and businesses do not have electricity. Much of New Orleans lacks a dependable supply of potable water, and only \$44 billion of the \$110 billion appropriated for rebuilding assistance to victims has been spent. Yet what are we doing today? Focusing on horses.

This bill was defeated 37-3 in committee. The Patient's Bill of Rights, cosponsored by Mr. DINGELL, was supported by the majority of this House and the majority of the Senate, and it died in conference, for political reasons. This bill here is for political reasons.

While this body considers this legislation today, the Republican leadership refuses to allow an up-or-down vote on providing a long overdue increase for the minimum wage.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend, the chairman of the committee, soon to be, maybe. Who knows. Mr. GOODLATTE, I apologize for that.

The Republican leadership refuses to allow an up-or-down vote on the minimum wage. And that is not about horses; it is about 6.6 million Americans working every day and living in poverty. I have concern about these horses, but I have much, much more concern about 6.6 million Americans who are living in poverty while working 40-hour weeks.

We have still not passed legislation that moves our Nation towards energy independence, yet we focus on horses.

Reforms are broken in the immigration system, yet we focus on horses.

We have not addressed the fact that 46 million Americans do not have health insurance, yet we focus on horses.

We need fixes to the Republicans' flawed prescription drug program and reforms to our convoluted tax system, yet we focus on horses. I am concerned about horses, but I am much, much more concerned about the American people. That is what we ought to be focused on. That's where we ought to be paying attention.

That is why I call this the "do less than 'do-nothing Congress of 1948.'"

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I would say on behalf of this Congress that we did pass an energy bill. We did pass a prescription drug bill. We did pass a bill to expedite refinery building in this country. We did pass an outer continental shelf exploration bill. And we would have had this bill on the floor 2, 3, 4 years ago if the Ag Committee had been willing to cooperate with us.

But to talk about this business of horse slaughter, I think the American people have every right to know what this business is really all about. It is a secretive, illicit and grossly inhumane business. Now, you listen to the members of the Ag Committee and the Department of Agriculture, and they talk about the transportation of these animals as regulated and that there is no ill will coming to these animals.

I have a picture here of a horse that was transported from Mississippi to Texas to Beltex on August 10, 2006. Now, if you look, I will show you that picture, and then I want to show you this picture. Now, the reason this happened is because a killer buyer by the name of Robbie Solomon from Belmont, Mississippi, put 17 stallions in one trailer.

Now, Mr. SALAZAR was here talking about his knowledge of horses, and I am sure he is quite knowledgeable, but anyone knows that you do not put stallions together. And the only way they were able to keep them from fighting was to beat these animals. This is going on all across the country because the USDA is not enforcing the transportation regulations.

And so when we talk about slaughter, we are not talking about the actual slaughter of the horse per se; we are talking about the horse theft involved. We are talking about the killer buyers getting animals any way they can get them. We are talking about them putting them in trailers like this and transporting horses.

I find it so interesting that the American Association of Equine Practitioners, the leadership, and the leadership of the American Quarter Horse Association talk about their concern for these horses. They are looking out for their welfare, yet they see nothing wrong with the method of transport, the double-deck trailers being used,

where horses full grown cannot even stand up straight on the upper deck.

Just think, stallions put together. You never do that. And that is precisely what Mr. Robbie Solomon of Belmont, Mississippi, did. So I did want to point out exactly what is going on in this transportation of these animals to slaughter, and this is not something that is uncommon.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE).

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman. In Nebraska, we have a great many horses that are used for roping, cutting horses, riding horses and quarter horses. Not many racehorses. These horses are primarily for a function, and when a horse can no longer fulfill that function, something has to happen to the horse. Now, you can retire the horse and pay \$2,000, \$3,000 a year to house it, to feed it and to take care of it, but some people that own 15, 20, 30, 40, 50 horses simply cannot afford to do that.

So I have been hearing from a great many horse owners, and these are people who care about horses, who love horses and who are concerned about horses, who have working ranches, and they say this is a bill that they cannot live with because of the cost. So I think we have to look at that.

I certainly don't tolerate and don't condone any shipment that is, as has been mentioned, injurious. We don't want to see that. But we have to have some way, because this will decrease the value of the average horse about \$300 simply because of the burial fees and the extra costs of taking care of horses.

So this is not a solution to the problem. The people in my area oppose it, and I would strongly urge we defeat the bill.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the Dean of the House, the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, my good friend, JOHN DINGELL.

(Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DINGELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

I love the people who are pushing this bill, but it is a bad bill. It is triumph of emotion over common sense. We have before us a solution, a poor one, to a nonexistent problem.

We have many things that need to be addressed in this Congress, but here we are putting on the floor a piece of legislation poorly thought out, without having had proper hearings or proceedings, over the opposition of a committee, when we have many other things that need doing; health care for Americans, minimum wage, a budget deficit of terrifying proportions, and the appropriations bills and the budget

have not yet been completed. While the Nation is at war, working families struggle to make ends meet, and government runs record deficits the leadership has put this curious piece of legislation on the floor.

The bill would eliminate humane slaughter of horses. If there is a complaint about how the horses are being slaughtered or transported, there is a way for this body to address that, and I am sure in good will this body would in the exercise of its oversight powers do exactly that.

The bill does not count for the high cost of caring for these unwanted animals, nor does it consider the impact that this legislation is going to have on the environment.

□ 1300

You know, we have a curious situation where we are going to have to wind up cremating every horse that dies in the country, or we are going to have to incinerate them. I have no idea how we are going to dispose of a huge number of 1,500 to 2,000 pounds of horse each time one of these events happens.

Now, basic care costs \$1,800. There is no requirement here that a person sell or slaughter his horse. The owner of the horse can do what he wants with it. That makes eminent good sense to me.

But I don't think anyone has thought out the consequences of this legislation, what is going to happen with regard to the massive number of horses that are going to have to be incinerated or cremated and the consequences of that with regard to the environment.

This is a bad piece of legislation. It should be rejected.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ).

Mr. GONZALEZ. Madam Chairman, I thank my colleague from Illinois for allowing me the 3 minutes on this particular issue.

I think much has been said, but I think if we look at it as legislators, our profession, our duties and our service to our constituents, what is it that we do? We pass laws that reflect the standards, the norms and the mores of American society.

It is already acknowledged, and I think even the opponents of this piece of legislation that I support here today would acknowledge we have already established a norm and a standard, and that is in this country we will not destroy a horse for human consumption. That is a done deal, that is recognized, and it is based on the historical significance of the horse in our society, which is very unique.

Now, this is the question that I pose: How can you prohibit the human consumption of a product, that is the law, that is the norm, that is the standard, that is the American value, without prohibiting the production of the product? And that is what this piece of legislation accomplishes. It is not a difficult legislative equation.

And there will be consequences, but consequences that can be dealt with responsibly by the horse owner. And I truly believe that. I am from the State of Texas, and we have a few horses in Texas. My brother owns horses. Now, does he agree with me on this particular piece of legislation, because it may prove to be inconvenient and pose some economic cost to him? I am not really sure. But this is in keeping with what we have already established, and that is how we treat horses in our society.

Now, we have individuals that will say this is about property rights. Members of Congress, please. We pass laws every day that regulate the manner that we conduct ourselves with pieces of property, personal and real. We have zoning laws. We have ordinances. And this is just another aspect of that, in keeping, though, with what has already been established as societal norms, and that is what we do here today.

People will simply say, but it is not about consumption of horse meat in the United States, that we are just simply going to cater to the culinary needs of the French. That is not the point. The point is that you still have everything that entails the entire process of how you prepare, how you slaughter the horse for human consumption. Whether it is domestic or internationally, it is not in keeping with the established norms and values as reflected in our laws, State and Federal, when it comes to the treatment of horses.

The bottom line is we have to sometimes tweak existing laws to make sure that they reflect those mores and that value, and that is what we are doing here today.

We cannot condone the slaughter of horses for human consumption.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Madam Chairman, I would like to address one issue that the distinguished gentleman from Michigan raised, and we all have great admiration and respect for the gentleman from Michigan. He raised the question about how are we going to take care of all these horses that are not slaughtered when they die and the impact of those animals on the environment.

I would remind the body that there are 133 million cows in America today. Every year many of them die out in the fields. Some of them are picked up by renderers and processed, but many of them are drug to the back 40 where they are decomposed, eaten by scavengers and whatever. The same thing would happen to horses that die out in the fields.

In my State of Kentucky, only about 40 percent of the animals that die in the fields are picked up by renderers. This bill would not affect what happens to natural death to animals in the field in any way whatsoever.

I would remind the body that only 1 percent of the entire horse population in America, which is about 9 million, is

being slaughtered. Less than that. I also would like to reiterate, once again, we have heard so much about unwanted horses. I would say to you, many of these horses being slaughtered are not unwanted, there is not anything wrong with them. Many of them are stolen and obtained by misrepresentation. So to leave the impression that every horse slaughtered is old, decrepit, unwanted, is certainly not what the facts show.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds to say that that is 1 percent of the horses per year, 90,000 or 1 percent of the 9 million per year. The average life expectancy of a horse is over 25 years. So about 25 percent of the horses go through this process in this country, and we will have a huge problem if we don't resolve that, if we pass this bill.

Madam Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding and for leading this cause.

I rise in opposition to H.R. 503. H.R. 503, the Horse Protection Act, would ban the processing of horses for human consumption. There is no evidence that suggests that products derived from horses pose any food safety or public health risk. Because processing facilities process meat intended for interstate shipment, they must be inspected by USDA for compliance with the Horse Slaughter Act, the Federal Meat Inspection Act, and other Federal animal health and food safety regulations.

The people who want this bill passed claim that horses are not raised for meat. However, there are at least three breeds that are raised for meat: the Yili, the Altai and the Bashkir, among others, that are raised for dual purposes.

Every year, 80,000 to 100,000 of these horses are abandoned in the U.S., and this number is expected to double in just a few years. But there are no provisions to address disposal or care of the unwanted 100,000 horses.

When horses are euthanized on private lands, it is normally done with a heavy dose of barbiturates. Once that horse succumbs to the barbiturates, the carcass becomes an environmental concern. And if the horse is disposed of on private land, we have to be concerned about the issues that lead to contamination, human exposure to zoonotic disease and related problems.

The individuals who support H.R. 503 and argue unwanted horses can be moved to adoption facilities or resold are selling us short on the resources. The total take capacity for all these facilities is 6,000 head; 6,000 head. These facilities are already at overcapacity. Where would the additional 100,000 horses go? I would add that is a cumulative total of perhaps a 10-year rolling total of 100,000 a year. It may be 1 million horses. But these horses are eating our cellulose and costing us ethanol.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, I want to address this unwanted horse issue again. Everyone keeps talking about slaughter as the answer to unwanted horses. Has anyone ever thought about the responsibility of the breeders that are breeding these horses?

The one horse industry association that most advocates horse slaughter is the American Quarter Horse Association. That is because they are the most prolific breeders in the country. They are registering 144,000 foals a year, compared to 32,000 thoroughbreds, 12,000 standardbreds.

Has anyone ever asked the question, what is the responsibility of the breeder? And for them to have the audacity to come to the Congress and say you have to pay us if you pass this bill to take care of all these horses that we are breeding every year.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Madam Chairman, I just wanted to say, unless I don't know something here, I don't believe it is illegal to consume horse meat in the United States. If you want to shoot your horse and butcher it and eat it, you can do it. So people need to understand that, number one.

Number two, I am in receipt of a letter here from Ron DeHaven, who is the administrator of APHIS, and I would just like to make folks aware of this, that contrary to what has been said, they have enforcement going on in terms of the transport of horses.

There are 187 cases that have been opened since 2002. They have issued 69 warnings. Eighty-one cases remain open. Three of those are being investigated. Seventy-eight are on final review. Twenty-one cases included stipulations. There have been fines anywhere from several hundred dollars to \$60,000 for violation of humane transport requirements. One case is currently being adjudicated by an administrative law judge requesting that the violator submit \$85,000 in penalties.

APHIS says that they take very seriously their responsibility to ensure safe and humane transport of horses to slaughter. So they have been trying to enforce this law; and if there is problems going on, you ought to get a hold of APHIS and do what they should do.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Just to respond to the gentleman from Kentucky, who asks a very good question about the responsibility of horse owners and horse breeders, I guess my question to the gentleman is, why doesn't his bill contain any provisions to prevent the creation of unwanted horses? That is one of the principal objections that these respected

national organizations have to this legislation, is that he does not address that in his bill.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. WALTER JONES.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky.

Madam Chairman, I decided I wanted to come to the floor today and not share my thoughts on this issue, but the thoughts of an American citizen. This lady lives in Carlinville, Illinois. She wrote me a letter on Saturday, and I was so impressed with the letter that I called this lady yesterday, Mrs. Betty Scheldt. I asked permission that I might read two paragraphs from her letter that I think speaks to this issue.

First: "Horses are an integral part of the American culture and I am extremely distressed over the fact that our horses, icons of our culture, are being slaughtered in foreign-owned slaughterhouses to please the palates of wealthy gourmets in Belgium and France. Horse slaughter and human consumption of horse meat is not and never will be acceptable in American culture. Americans overwhelmingly agree that horse slaughter should be banned. Several national voter surveys reveal that 77 percent to 90 percent of Americans feel that horses in the United States are not bred, raised or produced as food stock, and as such should be afforded the same protection from commercial slaughter as are all other non-food producing animals.

The last paragraph: "Horses are our companions and partners. They carry our children in competition at the county 4-H fair, make our country proud in the Olympic games, win Kentucky Derbys and Triple Crowns, carried our soldiers into battle and helped our forefathers to settle this country. They deserve better than ending up served on the plates of fancy restaurants from Belgium and Paris."

Madam Chairman, I join my colleagues today who support H.R. 503, and I hope and pray that this Congress will pass this legislation because horses are part of the history of this Nation and the West would never have been settled if it had not been for the horses working with the American citizens to build America.

SEPTEMBER 1, 2006.

Subject: Please vote for H.R. 503 as originally introduced.

Hon. WALTER JONES, Jr.
U.S. Representative,
Greenville, NC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE JONES: I am writing to urge you to vote for H.R. 503, the American Horse Slaughter Prevention Act, as originally introduced by Representatives John Sweeney (R-NY), John Spratt (D-SC) and Ed Whitfield (R-KY). This bill would prohibit permanently the slaughter of horses for human consumption overseas, as well as the exportation of horseflesh and live horses intended for slaughter, making sure that no American horse is slaughtered abroad.

Over the past 20 years, due to ever increasing public awareness of the trade of horses

for human consumption, the vast majority of plants that slaughter horses are no longer in operation. However, 3 foreign owned and operated horse slaughter plants still operate in our country today despite overwhelming objection by the majority of Americans. The meat produced in these plants is sent to certain European and Asian countries where it is considered a delicacy.

Horses are an integral part of the American culture and I am extremely distressed over the fact that our horses, icons of our culture, are being slaughtered in foreign-owned slaughterhouses to please the palates of wealthy gourmets in Belgium and France. Horse slaughter and human consumption of horse meat is not, and never will be, acceptable in American culture. Americans overwhelmingly agree that horse slaughter should be banned. Several national voter surveys reveal that 77%-94% of Americans feel that horses in the United States are not bred, raised or produced as food-stock, and as such should be afforded the same protection from commercial slaughter as are all other non-food producing animals.

The slaughter process is inhumane: Horses endure repeated blows to the head with stunning equipment that does not render the animals unconscious and many horses are still conscious during the remaining stages of the process. The transportation of these horses to the slaughter plants is also cruel and inhumane since they are hauled several thousand miles without water, food or rest in double-deck trailers, forcing them to travel in a bent position which can result in prolonged suffering and death.

Arguments from the AVMA and AAEP defending the "humanity" of horse slaughter are simply ludicrous. To suggest that a process in which horses endure repeated blows and are often slaughtered while conscious is somehow humane is not only absurd but also shows a total disregard towards the welfare of the animals these two organizations claim to protect.

I strongly disagree with the claims of the horse slaughter industry that it provides a way to dispose of old and ailing horses. This is simply not true: According to official data from the Department of Agriculture, 92.3% of the horses slaughtered are in good or excellent condition. Pictures of the slaughterhouses' pens showing healthy, young horses further corroborate this data.

It is also false that the horse slaughter industry is rooted on a presumed "unwanted horse" problem as the horse slaughter industry maintains, simply because these plants are importing thousands of Canadian horses each year in order to cover the increasing foreign demand of horse meat. If there are so many unwanted horses in the U.S. as they claim why do they have to import them from Canada? The truth is that the "unwanted horse" theory is a bald-faced lie.

Horse slaughter promotes theft and abuse. After California banned it in 1998 horse theft dropped by 34% while there were no reported increase on abuse as the foreign-owned industry maintains. In addition, there was no documented rise in Illinois following closure of the state's only horse slaughter plant in 2002.

Horses are our companions and partners, they carry our children in competition at the county 4-H fair, make our country proud in the Olympic games, win Kentucky Derbies and Triple Crowns, carried our soldiers into battle and helped our forefathers to settle this country. They deserve better than ending up served on the plates of fancy restaurants from Brussels and Paris.

Again, I urge you to vote for H.R. 503 as originally introduced by Reps. Sweeney, Spratt and Whitfield. I also please request a response from you stating your position on

this issue. Thank you for your time and consideration of this letter.

Sincerely,

BETTY SCHELDT,
Carlinville, IL 62626.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the ranking member of the Committee on Resources, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

□ 1315

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Illinois for yielding me the time.

Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of the American Horse Slaughter Prevention Act. The House has gone on the record three times now in strong opposition to horse slaughter.

I hope my colleagues will maintain that record, maintain their consistency and give overwhelming support of this bill. It is a sad state of affairs when we have to fight to prevent the slaughter of more than 90,000 American horses a year.

Horses are an integral part of the tapestry of this country, an American icon. The horse is a symbol, a promise of possibility. Most of all, the horse is a companion, as we just heard in the letter of Mr. JONES's constituent in North Carolina. The horse is tied to the spirit of the American frontier, the homesteaders in covered horse-drawn wagons, a cowboy and the wild mustangs. All symbols of America.

The horse is a promise of possibility. How often Americans have sat in anticipation, watching the pageantry of thoroughbreds racing for the roses in the annual Kentucky Derby, while fully hoping for the triumph of some deserving underdog, perchance to see a rare Triple Crown winner, a truly American story.

But most importantly, the horse is a companion for many Americans in a treasured childhood memory. Little boys and girls for generations have ridden a carousel pony dreaming that some day they will have a real horse to ride, a companion.

Horses are a part of our identity and our heritage, and in America they are not for human consumption. But, unfortunately, that is the fate of many of these animals.

Today, three foreign-owned slaughter houses operate in the U.S., serving an overseas market in horse meat. Thousands more horses are shipped annually out of the U.S., destined for other foreign slaughter houses. Horse slaughter is an export-driven market. Americans do not want it, and we should not be facilitating it.

The horse slaughter industry and its allies are going to extreme lengths to prevent this ghastly, but lucrative, practice.

I hope that the House will once again pass this much-needed legislation and not see the Department of Agriculture circumvent the intent of Congress.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to

the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), a member of the House Agriculture Committee.

Mr. CONAWAY. I want to thank Mr. PETERSON for allowing me to speak today.

To set the record straight, I love horses. I own a horse. In fact, my horse, Skychief Poco, and I won the 1997 SandHills Rodeo and quarter horse show team penning championship. I have got the wherewithal to let him live out his days in the pasture behind my house. But if you notice, I have used the possessive pronoun "my" each time I describe my horse.

At its core, this isn't about people who love horses. This isn't about the American icon. This isn't about the kid who rides a carousel and wants to own a pony. This is about personal property rights. I have personal property that is a horse. He is not a pet necessarily. He is never going to be eaten, but that is not the issue here.

The title of the bill on the other side makes constant reference to the Slaughter Prevention Act or Slaughter Protection Act. Nothing in the bill has anything to do with the actual slaughter of the horses, the euthanasia of the horse, not the methods. Because if we are talking about methods that need to do it better, let's do that.

But this is an attack on the personal property rights of all horse owners out there in America. At its core, this is also about what happens to the carcass of a dead horse, whether it is an affront to the icon of America to process that horse carcass into food or whether to chop that horse up and put it in a landfill, or chop that horse up and bury it in your back yard. However you treat the carcass of that horse, that is really what this is about.

This strips out the personal value, the personal property value of every horse owner that chooses to dispose of their horses in various ways and that we all should take great interest in how that is done. That is not what this bill does. This strips simply strips out my right, my personal property rights, to own that horse and dispose of him at the point when I want to.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill. It is an attack on personal property rights without due process and is unfortunate.

One other piece of this bill is that, which is added toward the end of it, is that if you have a horse that is sore, and you are at a competition or at an event, the Secretary of Agriculture is allowed to come take that horse from you. So I would urge my colleagues to vote against this bill. It is ill conceived and should not pass.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chairman, at this time I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

(Mr. THORNBERRY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Chairman, I have been around and worked

with horses all my life. I think I have as much appreciation and admiration for these creatures as anyone in this body; but I am very much opposed to this bill, first, because, contrary to, I am sure, the intentions of this authors, this bill will result in more abuse, more neglect and more inhumane treatment of horses.

I would just say that those who are so certain that horses are better off to die peacefully out in the field have never come across an old horse out in a field or a pasture who cannot get up and stand on its legs and continues to beat its head against the ground in an effort to get leverage to stand back up. Such people have never come across an older horse down in the pasture or field and begins to be eaten by predators and can do nothing about it because he can't get back on his feet.

The idea that it is more humane to let all horses die peacefully in a field, rather than dealt with in a regulated, inspected manner, is just wrong. So the bottom line is, this bill results in more neglect and more abuse, more mistreatment of horses, as owners cannot afford to take care of them, or they are left to, quote, die peacefully in a field.

Secondly, it is a tremendous blow to private property rights. If anyone thinks there is any reason for the Congress to stop with a regulation of how we govern horses and not go right ahead and say what owners ought to do to their pigs and their cattle or their dogs and their cats or their fish in the aquarium, then you haven't realized the consequences of this bill. It is a bad idea. It should be rejected.

Madam Chairman, I have been around and worked with horses all of my life, and I think that I have as much appreciation and respect for these magnificent creations of God as anyone in this body. And I am strongly opposed to this bill.

The motives behind this proposal are, I am sure, honorable. But the consequences of it in the real world will be so detrimental to what the authors say they hope to achieve, that I wonder if some are intentionally turning a blind eye to them.

If old horses cannot be dealt with humanely, many of them will be left to suffer. Those who are so certain that all horses are better off being allowed to die of old age have never seen a horse that has been unable to get up and continues to beat its head against the ground for leverage to try to stand. How is that better for the animal?

If older horses cannot be sold here, they will be sold in Mexico, without our standards and inspections. How is that better for the animal?

The bottom line is that more horses will starve, more horses will be abused or neglected, more horses will suffer unnecessarily if this bill were to become law.

In addition, the precedent this bill would set would be deeply disturbing to the basic American principle of private property rights. If the Federal Government can dictate what individuals may and may not do with personal property—to whom it may or may not be sold—the fundamental right to own property will suffer a terrible blow.

Of course, there is no reason for the Federal legislation to stop with horses. Federal

law could regulate treatment of cattle and pigs, dogs and cats, or fish in the aquarium.

Criminal abuse of animals is a crime prosecuted by State and local authorities. A Federal law restricting the ability to sell private property based on some people's misguided idea of how that property should be treated is a dangerous thing, and this bill should be rejected.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WHITFIELD. A parliamentary inquiry. Could you explain the remaining time that is available.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mrs. CAPITO). Yes. The gentleman from Kentucky has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia has 4 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Minnesota has 4 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from Illinois has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Who has the right to close?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the majority leader's designee, Mr. GOODLATTE, for the closing speech.

Mr. WHITFIELD. At this time I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chairman, at this time I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the Chairman of the Energy and Commerce subcommittee that dealt with this issue, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

Mr. STEARNS. I thank my distinguished colleague. As the gentleman from Virginia pointed out, we had a hearing on July 25, 2006, on this same issue. My colleagues, I think it was a balanced hearing. I think Mr. WHITFIELD and Mr. SWEENEY were both there. Mr. SWEENEY testified, also Chairman GOODLATTE testified. I think it brought out the pros and cons of this.

Whatever is proposed, however, must have a full understanding of the ultimate effects on the American horse population and their caregivers, because arguments presented on both sides seem to paint a pretty bleak, bleak picture for a large number of horses. But I am concerned that H.R. 503 does not solve the problem of unwanted horses.

Unfortunately, it provides no solution to the unfortunate reality of the life of these horses. Horses are a beloved part of our American heritage and deserve more humane approaches at the end of their lives. I think we all agree.

But this bill, H.R. 503, does not solve the problem. In fact, as many point out, it is a property rights issue; and we should be concerned ultimately where these horses will finally graze and who will pay for it.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

(Mr. FARR asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FARR. Madam Chairman and Members, I rise in support of this bill. I have been listening to this debate all

day. I don't think most people have read it. The bill deals with the slaughter for humane consumption. Now, I represent California, the most populous State in the Union, which has the most horses.

Guess what, this has been the law in California for many years, and all of these naysayers and predictors of bad happening just doesn't happen in California. Change this debate; change this debate.

What if we were up here talking about slaughtering cats and dogs for profit for human consumption? You wouldn't have people up here saying, well, the cats and dogs population will ruin everything; it will stop the world. We take care. The slaughterers don't buy sick horses, injured horses. They buy fresh horses, and they buy them for human consumption. This bill says you can't do that.

Now this is the day and age in America when we ought to be not allowing people to for profit buy horses merely to slaughter them for human consumption. That is wrong. This bill is right.

I urge a rejection of the amendment and a passage of the bill.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY).

Mr. FOLEY. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the bill as well, H.R. 503, the Horse Slaughter Prevention Act. As a cosponsor of this bill, I believe this legislation is necessary to prevent the inhumane disposal of beautiful animals.

Horses hold a special place in this country. They were vital during our settlement, allowing us to travel great distances quickly and providing the necessary strength for farming. Today, we are able to appreciate their grace and speed in a variety of different venues from racing to recreational horses. They are all part of America.

The fact, though, is important to underscore. We don't allow horse meat to be eaten in this country. To allow the shipment of meat overseas is a bit hypocritical. While some may have expressed concern about the cost of disposing of sick horses, the fact is, according to the USDA, 90 percent of horses arriving in slaughter are in good condition.

There are many alternatives other than horse slaughtering, and among those options are horse welfare associations and equine sanctuaries. The bill responds to a strong American concern about the treatment of horses, in addition to prohibiting the trade and transfer of live horses intended for human consumption.

H.R. 503 lessens the USDA's workload by reducing the number of animals requiring inspection.

I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this bill.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As has been said very ably by the Dean of the House, Mr. DINGELL, this is

a solution to a problem that doesn't exist. There have been a lot of assertions made out here that I think are a little bit suspect.

But one of the things that I want to point out, the previous speaker, Mr. FARR, my good friend from California, claims that they have done this, and there are no problems, well, there was a peer-reviewed article in the Journal of Agribusiness which highlights the lack of enforcement in California of their law, anecdotal evidence of increased horse abandonment, malnutrition, greater numbers of thin and crippled horses at auction in California. So this is a peer-reviewed article that refutes that assertion that was made by Mr. FARR.

This is a bill that on the merits is a bad bill. It was defeated in the Agriculture Committee by a vote of 37-3 because those of us on the Agriculture Committee represent rural America, represent the areas that have horses and use horses every day. The American Quarter Horse Association, the American Paint Horse Association, the biggest horse associations in the country oppose this bill.

There are a lot of good reasons; but the main reason, in my opinion, is that this is just absolutely the wrong way to do business in the House of Representatives. As has been pointed out by Mr. HOYER and by others, we have many more priorities that we ought to be working on in this Congress other than this bill. That is, you know, obvious.

But, you know, it really offends me to take the work of the committee, and this can be any issue, and overturn it and put a bill on the floor that is completely opposed to what the committee decided. I think it is absolutely the wrong way to run this institution and probably is the best reason for us not to pass this legislation.

I just have to say one other thing. I just was up in Hallock, Minnesota, the other day, and one of the main things that we ought to be doing in this Congress, that we haven't done, that we have been trying to do since last December, is get disaster legislation passed to help those people that got wiped out in 2005 and to help the people that have been wiped out here in 2006. That would be a much better use of the Agriculture Committee's time on the floor of the House of Representatives than dealing with this bill.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and send this bill where it belongs, that is, back to the committee.

□ 1330

Madam Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the chairman of the committee.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I want to point out there is a book called, "Alternatives to Auction and Slaughter: A Guide for Equine Owners (A Better Way)," that lists all kinds of

places that welcome animals that are at the end of their lives and are unwanted.

Quite frankly, I find really disingenuous those on the other side who oppose this legislation who say those of us who support ending horse slaughter are actually going to be hurting horses more, that we somehow don't get it. I think that is very disrespectful to the well over 500 organizations that support this bill, including the American Horse Defense Fund, the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, the Animal Protection Institute, the Humane Society of the United States. Clearly, I could go on and on. These are organizations that are in business for the sole purpose of making sure that animals are treated humanely. They are not mistaken in supporting this legislation.

Those of us who truly care about the welfare of horses should support this legislation.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, I would say this: The State of Texas tried to close these slaughter houses down for many years. Officials there did. A lawsuit was filed by the slaughter houses. Remember, they are foreign-owned, Belgian, Dutch and French. In that lawsuit, the slaughter houses owned by the foreign companies won that lawsuit because the Federal judge said that this is an interstate commerce issue; and there is Federal preemption involved; and if you are going to shut down slaughter houses in operation in interstate commerce, then the U.S. Congress has to act.

Now this bill came before the Energy and Commerce Committee because of the lack of action on the Ag Committee for many years. They never wanted it to see the light of day.

I would urge Members to vote for H.R. 503. As I have said before, the unwanted horse argument is not a real argument because horses being slaughtered are not unwanted. To think that we would have the responsibility of reimbursing owners who are overbreeding, who have the responsibility to take care of their own horses, they make it appear that the government has that responsibility. Owners have their own responsibility.

Private property rights, this bill protects private property rights. Because of the number of horses being stolen, we are protecting those private property rights.

This bill allows an owner, a rancher or farmer who owns a horse to do whatever he wants to with the horse. He can shoot it or slaughter it and eat it himself. We simply are shutting down an illicit, secretive business, and that is what this bill is all about.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

There is no doubt in anyone's mind that this is an emotionally charged issue. But passion when left unchecked can have negative consequences. That

is exactly the situation we find ourselves in today.

I have asked my colleagues to consider the consequences of this legislation, as did I and the 36 bipartisan members of the House Committee on Agriculture. And the gentleman wonders why they have never dealt with it; the committee voted 37-3 to report this bill unfavorably with the recommendation that it not pass the House. And I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for his leadership on his side of the aisle and for yielding me some of his time.

Also, more than 200 reputable national and State organizations, including the American Veterinary Medical Association, the American Association of Equine Practitioners, the horse doctors who polled their members, 80 percent were opposed to this legislation. Also opposed are the American Farm Bureau Federation, the American Quarter Horse Association, the National Association of Counties, and every State horse council in the country that has taken a stand on this issue, including New York, Florida, Texas, Ohio, Illinois, Virginia, North Carolina, have all opposed this legislation.

The consequences of this legislation are far-reaching and stand to jeopardize the welfare of America's horse population and will potentially place a significant financial burden on horse owners across the Nation.

Instead of solving problems, H.R. 503 creates problems. It provides no directive as to what will happen to the 90,000 unwanted horses annually processed in slaughter facilities, and it increases the probability of unwanted horses becoming victims of neglect, starvation and abandonment. That is not just my opinion; that is the opinion of the American Veterinary Medical Association and the American Association of Equine Practitioners.

H.R. 503 provides no funding for alternatives and no instructions for the regulation of rescue or shelter facilities to ensure the welfare of these unwanted and unusable horses. The influx of unwanted horses would flood the already inadequate, overburdened, unregulated rescue-and-adoption facilities. There are roughly 6,000 slots in America's horse shelters and rescue facilities, 6,000. The majority of these shelters are operated by individuals who are able to take one, maybe two, horses at a time. These shelters and rescue facilities cannot possibly accommodate many, many times, 20, 30 times that number of horses that would be created by this bill.

It limits horse owners' availability of choice of how to dispose of their animals and infringes on owners' private property rights.

Horse owners have a variety of options when seeking to get rid of an unusable or unwanted horse, including rescue or retirement facilities, private sale, donation, euthanasia and processing facilities. Depending on the indi-

vidual needs of the owner and the horse, some options may be more feasible than others. By eliminating this option, we are dictating what horse owners can and cannot do with their own private property. We must respect the right of responsible owners to choose the option best suited for their unique circumstances.

It mandates costs on private citizens. If the bill were enacted as written and the processing of horses for human consumption was no longer a legal option for owners to dispose of unwanted horses, estimates place the additional number of unwanted horses at 272,000 within the first 6 years.

Today we take care of 20,000 wild horses in corrals out west that cost us \$50 million a year. Imagine having 10, 15, 20 times as many horses to take care of who are in that same situation. The cost to private horse owners of maintaining these horses has been conservatively estimated to be between \$3 and \$4 billion. By eliminating the option of horse processing facilities, thereby limiting the option of owners to dispose of their property, Congress would be forcing a \$3 to \$4 billion burden on private citizens and maybe perhaps to State and local governments, one of the reasons why the National Association of Counties is concerned about protecting private property rights.

The bottom line, H.R. 503 does not solve problems; it creates problems. I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mrs. CUBIN. Madam Chairman, I would like to make this very clear: if you believe in the humane treatment of animals, this bill takes us a step backwards. If you believe in preserving a balanced and natural ecosystem, this bill moves us in the wrong direction. If you believe in personal property rights, this bill represents an outright assault on that uniquely American ideal.

There are many who will come before the House today and will say that Americans are thoughtlessly slaughtering young, strong horses—symbols of the American West—and that there can be no good reason for this slaughter. I am here today to tell you that this is not the case.

In my home State of Wyoming, we proudly display a bucking bronco as a symbol of our Western heritage. In fact, one of the first memories of my life is sitting on the back of a horse. I love horses as much as anyone here, and just like the proponents of this bill, I do not want to see these animals suffer. But I rise today to say that if enacted, this legislation would create more suffering for both horse and human.

By opposing this bill, we are not striking out at symbols of the American West. In fact, we are making a responsible herd management decision that protects horses, humans, and the ecosystem. Many of these horses are old, ill, starving due to overpopulation, or they have otherwise ceased in their proper function.

But you don't need to take my word for it. As many have already stated, over 200 reputable horse organizations, animal health organizations, and agricultural organizations have voiced their strong opposition to this bill.

Most importantly, I have heard loud and clearly from folks who know and love horses more than anyone in this chamber—Wyoming's ranchers. These hard working ranching families breed their own horses, they help deliver them at birth, they train them, they feed and raise them, and they care for them when they are sick. Every day of their lives they are interacting with the horses that they love. Wyoming's ranchers depend on horses for their livelihood. They know all there is to know about caring for a horse, because in the harsh seasons on the high plains and in the Rocky Mountains, they have to know in order to survive.

These folks know their animals like they know themselves. And yet, today, we are considering a bill that will tie their hands, preventing them from making a humane choice for their horses. Today we are considering a bill that will sentence innumerable horses to a life of starvation and suffering. Today, we are considering passing a bill that will have untold disastrous effects on the ecosystem.

I sincerely admire the motivation of those in favor of this bill today. If only their love for these regal creatures was enough to care for the needs of the 90,000 unwanted horses this bill will create each year, then there would be no need for this debate. If only their zeal to defend these animals could somehow control the overpopulated wild horse herds roaming the plains of Wyoming, Montana, Idaho, Utah and Colorado, then we would have no need for humane population control. But the honest truth, Madam Chairman, is that this bill offers no solutions. We cannot absorb 90,000 horses a year. If we pass this bill, we will be putting rhetoric above the realities of ranch life; and we will be elevating a mistaken idea about Western symbols above the livelihood of Wyoming's ranchers. I cannot support such a measure.

I urge my colleagues to put their emotions aside, look past the surface, and into the real policy problems this bill will create. Vote "no" on H.R. 503.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Chairman, I strongly oppose the slaughter of horses for human consumption.

For this reason I am a cosponsor of H.R. 503. This bill prohibits the shipping, transporting, moving, delivering, receiving, possessing, purchasing, selling, or donation of horses and other equines to be slaughtered for human consumption.

An overwhelming majority of my constituents from the Dallas, Texas, area are opposed to horse slaughter, and my vote reflects their will.

My office phone has been ringing off the hook with constituents opposed to horse slaughter. I have received more than 500 letters in the past few days. All are opposed to horse slaughter.

Horses are a symbol of American freedoms. They are a part of our history, our culture, and they deserve better.

Three slaughterhouses remain in the United States, and unfortunately two of them are in Texas. These meat factories kill about 100,000 American horses per year, sending the meat to countries overseas for fine dining.

Madam Chairman, I vigorously oppose this gruesome practice. And I don't agree with the argument that shutting down these slaughterhouses will hurt the local economies or be inhumane for horses.

In my opinion, this bill protects American horses from being raised—and slaughtered—for human consumption.

I support H.R. 503 and urge my colleagues to support it as well.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Chairman, this week the census bureau released a report showing that for the first time since 1998, the number of uninsured children increased. Of the 8.3 million children without health insurance, minority children constitute a disproportionate share. The latest census figures also show that a record 46.6 Americans lack health insurance. With crucial issues facing the country such as the health care crisis, a broken immigration system, shortfalls in homeland security, and a stagnant minimum wage, I am baffled that the Republican leadership would spend precious time on horse slaughter legislation.

I do not want to minimize the importance of banning inhumane slaughter of horses for purposes of human consumption overseas. In fact, I am a cosponsor of H.R. 503, the American Horse Slaughter Prevention Act and support clean passage of that legislation. However, it is distressing that with only approximately 15 legislative days before the election, Republicans are ignoring the priorities of the American people.

I am troubled that the 109th Congress will be remembered in history as a “do-nothing” Congress. According to the Library of Congress, the House of Representatives in 2006 is on track to be in session for the fewest number of days since 1948. When the Congress has been in session, Republicans have pushed divisive and unproductive legislation such as constitutional amendments banning gay marriage and flag burning.

The time is long overdue to address the people's business. Several months ago, both the House and Senate passed immigration and border security bills. Instead of working out an agreement on illegal immigration, Republicans scheduled new field hearings in swing districts. With more talk and less action, the Republican led Congress and White House have failed to gain control over the border. They have failed to conduct workplace enforcement of immigration laws and have thus failed to protect American workers from declining low wages.

Republican inaction on homeland security is even more disconcerting. The bipartisan 9/11 Commission has given this Administration and the rubberstamp Republican congressional leaders poor grades for failing to implement the Commission's recommendations. We must take immediate steps to secure our borders, strengthen security around sensitive infrastructure, and give our first responders the necessary resources to protect the country.

Republican leadership has failed to improve the American people's economic security. As CEO compensation has soared, real family income is down since 2001. Since 1997, Republicans have repeatedly rejected a minimum wage increase for 6.6 million of the hardest working Americans. We must provide a livable wage so families can afford to make ends meet.

With the American people paying our salaries, we in the Congress have a duty to solve their problems. It is about time the Republican-led Congress earned its paycheck.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Chairman, I cannot support this bill in its present form.

I understand and appreciate the views of its proponents, many of them in Colorado, who are distressed about the fact that three slaughterhouses in this country are in the business of preparing horse flesh for human consumption—primarily in other countries.

The bill's supporters do not think this is appropriate, and that Congress should exercise its authority over interstate commerce in order to put an end to this business. That is what this bill is intended to do.

I can understand the discomfort many Americans have about consumption of horse flesh, although of course it has been and remains an accepted practice in some places.

But emotional concerns cannot be the only guiding force in legislation regarding the way livestock is managed, and prohibiting slaughter of horses for human consumption—the main market for horse flesh at this time—would have unintended consequences this legislation fails to address.

The hearings held by the Agriculture Committee made it clear that there the current horse sanctuaries do not have the capacity to care for the additional unwanted horses—which otherwise would be handled by slaughterhouses that would result from the bill's enactment. That was one reason the committee, on a bipartisan basis reported the legislation unfavorably.

I voted for an amendment that would have delayed implementation of the bill until the Agriculture Department determined that adequate sanctuaries were ready. Unfortunately, that amendment was not adopted. Similarly, state and local governments—including the Colorado Department of Agriculture and the Commissioners of Adams County—are concerned that shutting off the slaughterhouse outlet will lead to an increased number of unwanted horses being abandoned and left to be dealt with by local authorities. I am attaching letters from the Colorado Commissioner on Agriculture and Adams County Commissioners who oppose this legislation. I voted for an amendment to provide federal reimbursement to local governments faced with such a problem. However, that amendment also was rejected.

Because of these problems, I cannot vote for the bill as it stands. Finally, I must note that with the nation at war in Iraq and Afghanistan, everyday Americans struggling with a mediocre economy and high energy costs, there are more pressing issues Congress needs to address than this one.

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Chairman, I rise today in honor of our country's beloved horses. It is my hope that Congress will pass H.R. 503 unamended, the American Horse Slaughter Prevention Act. This bill will end horse slaughter for human consumption in the United States and the cruel practices associated with this inhumane industry.

When horses are sold to slaughter they are often transported in overcrowded trucks, deprived of food and water, exposed to the elements and made to stand in their own waste. The slaughter bound horse can be sick or injured but forced to suffer a lack of appropriate veterinary care. The stress that horses are subjected to, both during transportation and at the slaughterhouse, triggers horses' natural flight response. At the slaughterhouse a horse can be ineffectively stunned before dismemberment, meaning that a horse may remain conscious while being bound and then

elevated by one leg prior to having its throat slit.

H.R. 503 encourages responsible horse ownership. For horse owners, who are no longer able or willing to care for a horse, H.R. 503 finds appropriate alternatives to slaughter that may range from finding a new home for the horse to humane euthanasia preformed by a licensed veterinarian.

Documentation from the three remaining equine slaughterhouses in the United States show that America's wild horses have been among their victims. Additional victims include stolen, as well as healthy horses. This legislation will stop the sale of wild, stolen or healthy horses to slaughter houses for human consumption at a profit.

The word humane is defined as being marked by compassion, sympathy and consideration for animals. The question we must ask ourselves is if subjecting horses to this kind of circumstance is indeed humane? Is horse slaughter marked by compassion, sympathy and consideration for the animal? The only realistic conclusion is no.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 503 and to oppose all amendments designed to weaken this important bill.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have joined 202 of my colleagues in cosponsoring the American Horse Slaughter Prevention Act and I rise today in support of its passage. It is time to put a stop to a business that has been allowed to go on for far too long.

Many Americans have made their stance on this issue clear: a recent poll shows that almost 7 percent of Americans are in favor of banning horse slaughter. The slaughtering process is one that is shockingly inhumane—when transported to slaughtering houses, horses are crammed into trucks and may go unfed for as many as 28 hours. Animals that survive this ordeal often die by the captive bolt, an instrument meant to cause immediate trauma to the brain but is often used improperly, resulting in slow and painful deaths.

Those who oppose this law believe H.R. 503 will result in an overpopulation of horses. Yet the Department of Agriculture has found that 5,000 horses have been imported to slaughter plants since August 2004. As the Humane Society of the United States rightly observes, there would be no reason to import horses if we have an overpopulation.

Opponents of this bill have also warned that horses who would otherwise be slaughtered would not receive adequate care once they are transferred to alternate homes or rescue facilities. But horse rescue groups are required to abide by state and local animal welfare laws. California banned horse slaughter in 1998 and there has been no documented rise in cruelty and neglect cases. Similarly, there was no increase in brutality toward horses following the closing of Illinois' only slaughter plant in 2002.

There is no reason why the inhumane treatment of these animals should continue, particularly when our horses are being slaughtered solely for the purpose of pleasing foreign diners. I urge all my colleagues to join me in support of this bill.

Mr. KIRK. Madam Chairman, I rise today in strong support in H.R. 503, which would prohibit the slaughtering of horses for human consumption. Last year more than 90,000 American horses were slaughtered in this country by three foreign-owned plants. Horse meat is

not eaten in the United States, but it has been exported to overseas markets, such as France, Belgium, Japan and Italy. Animals deserve to be treated humanely, and I do not support this industry.

This Congress made its opposition to horse slaughter clear in the Agriculture Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 2006. I supported an amendment introduced by Representative SWEENEY and Representative WHITFIELD that would have essentially tied the hands of the horse slaughter industry. Unfortunately the language approved by both the House and Senate, which had the clear intention of ending this industry, was altered in conference and allowed the slaughtering of horses to continue.

H.R. 503 would permanently shut down this inhumane practice. This legislation has wide bipartisan support in the House as well as extensive backing from the animal welfare community. I want to specifically thank Representative SWEENEY and Representative WHITFIELD for their hard work and leadership on this important issue.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 503

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. PROHIBITION ON SHIPPING, TRANSPORTING, MOVING, DELIVERING, RECEIVING, POSSESSING, PURCHASING, SELLING, OR DONATION OF HORSES AND OTHER EQUINES FOR SLAUGHTER FOR HUMAN CONSUMPTION.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—Section 2 of the Horse Protection Act (15 U.S.C. 1821) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) as paragraphs (2), (3), (5), and (6), respectively;

(2) by inserting before paragraph (2), as so redesignated, the following new paragraph:

“(1) The term ‘human consumption’ means ingestion by people as a source of food.”; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (3), as so redesignated, the following new paragraph:

“(4) The term ‘slaughter’ means the killing of one or more horses or other equines with the intent to sell or trade the flesh for human consumption.”.

(b) **FINDINGS.**—Section 3 of the Horse Protection Act (15 U.S.C. 1822) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (5) as paragraphs (6) through (10), respectively;

(2) by adding before paragraph (6), as so redesignated, the following new paragraphs:

“(1) horses and other equines play a vital role in the collective experience of the United States and deserve protection and compassion;

“(2) horses and other equines are domestic animals that are used primarily for recreation, pleasure, and sport;

“(3) unlike cows, pigs, and many other animals, horses and other equines are not raised for the purpose of being slaughtered for human consumption;

“(4) individuals selling horses or other equines at auctions are seldom aware that the animals may be bought for the purpose of being slaughtered for human consumption; and

“(5) the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service of the Department of Agriculture has found that horses and other equines cannot be safely and humanely transported in double deck trailers.”; and

(3) by striking paragraph (8), as so redesignated, and inserting the following new paragraph:

“(8) the movement, showing, exhibition, or sale of sore horses in intrastate commerce, and the shipping, transporting, moving, delivering, receiving, possessing, purchasing, selling, or donation in intrastate commerce of horses and other equines to be slaughtered for human consumption, adversely affect and burden interstate and foreign commerce.”.

(c) **PROHIBITION.**—Section 5 of the Horse Protection Act (15 U.S.C. 1824) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (8) through (11) as paragraphs (9) through (12), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (7) the following new paragraph:

“(8) As a pilot program to evaluate the feasibility and practicability of imposing such a prohibition nation-wide, the shipping, transporting, moving, delivering, receiving, possessing, purchasing, selling, or donation of any horse or other equine in the States of Kentucky or New York to be slaughtered for human consumption, unless the equine—

“(A) is owned or controlled by a State or local government or owned by an individual who purchased the equine from a State or local government; or

“(B) will be slaughtered at a facility operating before the date of the enactment of this paragraph; or

“(C) will be slaughtered for human consumption for charitable or humanitarian purposes.”.

(d) **AUTHORITY TO DETAIN.**—Section 6(e) of the Horse Protection Act (15 U.S.C. 1825(e)) is amended—

(1) by striking the first sentence of paragraph (1);

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively; and

(3) by inserting before paragraph (2), as so redesignated, the following new paragraph:

“(1) The Secretary may detain for examination, testing, or the taking of evidence—

“(A) any horse at any horse show, horse exhibition, or horse sale or auction which is sore or which the Secretary has probable cause to believe is sore; and

“(B) any horse or other equine which the Secretary has probable cause to believe is being shipped, transported, moved, delivered, received, possessed, purchased, sold, or donated in violation of section 5(8).”.

(e) **REIMBURSEMENT.**—Section 11 of the Horse Protection Act (15 U.S.C. 1830) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 11. REIMBURSEMENT OF OWNERS FOR LOSS OF VALUE OF HORSES.

“The Secretary shall compensate the owner of an equine who disposes of such equine due to the prohibition under section 5(8). The Secretary shall compensate such owner for the total amount of—

“(1) the loss in value of the equine due to such prohibition; and

“(2) the costs incurred in the disposal of such equine.”.

(f) **RESPONSIBILITY FOR UNWANTED HORSES.**—The Horse Protection Act is further amended by inserting after section 11 (15 U.S.C. 1830), as amended by subsection (e), the following new section:

“SEC. 11A. RESPONSIBILITY FOR UNWANTED HORSES.

“The Secretary shall assume responsibility for any equine that is unwanted by an owner.”.

(g) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—Section 12 of the Horse Protection Act (15 U.S.C. 1831) is amended by striking “\$500,000” and inserting “\$5,000,000”.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in House Report 109-642. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the re-

port, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

The Chair has been notified that amendments No. 1 and 2 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 109-642.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. GOODLATTE:

In the paragraph (8) of section 5 of the Horse Protection Act, which is being added by subsection (c)(2) of section 1 of the bill, strike “consumption.” and insert the following: “consumption, except that this prohibition shall not take effect until 30 days after the date on which the Secretary of Agriculture certifies to Congress that sufficient sanctuaries exist in the United States to care for any horses that may be unwanted as a result of this prohibition.”.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 981, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

We have discussed many problems that the Sweeney-Whitfield bill will create with not a single solution in sight. While it is not possible to address all of those problems, we must address the fate of the horses affected by this bill.

I am joined by my ranking member, Mr. PETERSON, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), the gentleman from South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH), and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) in offering an amendment to address this concern.

The amendment would very simply say that until the Secretary of Agriculture can certify that sufficient sanctuary space is available to accommodate the unwanted horses created by this bill, the drastic step of a Federal mandate will be delayed.

Everyone debating this issue today is dedicated to the best care possible for horses. We profoundly disagree on how to achieve that laudable goal. The co-sponsors of this amendment believe it would be a tragedy to take the dramatic step of closing off a humane method of disposal of animals that the owners can no longer care for only to see them abandoned or killed wholesale at greater cost to their owners.

If we are to take this drastic step, we should at least ensure that the horses for whom it is being done continue to live out their lives in humane circumstances.

Nothing in this amendment would prevent the operation of H.R. 503 as long as there was assurance that a humane living alternative to the current system exists. It is impossible for me to believe that the supporters of H.R. 503 intend to replace the death of horses that they decry with abandonment or wholesale death at the hands of their owners.

The proponents of this bill have assured us there will be no flood of unwanted horses with no place to go as a result of this bill. If this is true, and reputable organizations like the American Veterinary Medical Association and the American Association of Equine Practitioners strongly dispute that, but if it is true, our amendment will be an easy procedural step to meet.

If, however, the Association of Equine Practitioners and major horse-owning groups who oppose H.R. 503 are correct that hundreds of thousands of unwanted horses with no place to go would be created in just a few years, this amendment can prevent a catastrophe for horses in this country.

I ask my colleagues to join us in passing this amendment that provides a solution for at least one of the problems created by this bill.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY) to respond.

Mr. SWEENEY. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong opposition. Let's be very clear, all of these amendments have one intended purpose, and that is to destroy the bill. So if you are in favor of the ban of horse slaughter for human consumption, you need to vote against all of the amendments.

This number, this establishment of an arbitrary number, is false. It will not be obtained because there are so many other options for horse owners other than horse sanctuary, but let's understand the facts.

The current horse population is estimated at 9 million. As has been said, each year, roughly 900,000 horses die. About 90,000, or 1 percent, are actually slaughtered. Furthermore, in 1989, the U.S. slaughtered over 342 horses. In 2005, they slaughtered 90,000. Since then, the United States slaughtered approximately 200,000 fewer horses. So 90,000 horses can be easily absorbed into the population. And not all of these horses will need to be absorbed into rescue and sanctuary populations. Horses will die or become sick or dangerous to their owners. These horses will need to be replaced. These horses will become pets or workhorses or show horses.

Both the Bureau of Land Management and hundreds of private organizations and agencies provide adoption programs for people to replace these horses by adopting new ones. Additionally, thousands of these horses are humanely euthanized each year.

Madam Chairman, this amendment, this proposal, is simply meant to en-

sure that this bill is never enacted. We should vote it down, and we should vote it down very strongly.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Madam Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise in support of this amendment. This bill displaces 90,000 horses a year, 90,000. In spite of what my good friend Mr. SWEENEY says, that is a lot of horses. Currently the horse facilities are already full. They can only take approximately 6,000 horses a year.

What do we do, Mr. SWEENEY, with those other 84,000 horses? This bill should not pass until the Secretary of Agriculture can certify to this Congress that there is enough space in these rescue facilities to accommodate all of these unwanted horses that have no place to go, no funds to care for them and no humane end-of-life option left for them.

So I support this amendment, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Talking about an amendment to create a problem that is not there, this is a perfect example of that. We have all of these organizations around the country who are voluntarily spending their time and money to provide a safe haven for horses, and this amendment basically is a killer amendment to defeat H.R. 503.

□ 1345

I would point out once again that each year the number of horses that have been slaughtered has been going down. We have gone from 300,000 down to 90,000. There is no evidence that society has had any problem in absorbing these horses. And I would also remind the gentleman many of these horses are stolen; so they are not unwanted horses. There is a need for them. So we know for a fact that the only purpose of any of these amendments is to make this bill ineffective, to kill this bill.

I am delighted that we are on the floor and have an opportunity to debate this, and I would urge every Member to oppose this amendment.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chairman, may I ask how much time is remaining on each side and who has the right to close.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Kentucky has 2½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Kentucky has the right to close.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I will respond to the gentleman from Kentucky and the gentleman from New York, who called this a poison pill.

This is no such thing whatsoever. They say there is no problem with unwanted horses. Then there will be no problem getting a certification that there is sufficient horse sanctuary facilities around the country to take care of them. I strongly dispute that.

I think the gentleman from New York and I, while we may disagree on numbers, can agree that 90,000 is 10 percent of 900,000, not 1 percent. But whatever that is, that is a substantial number of unwanted horses.

And, remember, the average life expectancy of a horse is 25 years. Many of these horses have many years of life expectancy left in them; so they are going to accumulate over a period of years. In fact, the American Veterinary Medical Association says over 6 years they will grow to 272,000 in number. That is far, far more than the capacity of all the horse sanctuaries around the country that exist today. And there is no sign of their growing rapidly to meet this need because they cannot even meet the current need to take care of the unwanted horses that exist in this country right now as we speak.

So I would urge my colleagues to support this very good amendment that will cure a very serious flaw in this legislation, and then we will have the opportunity to see who is correct about how many unwanted horses we are going to have in this country. Are the experts, the American Veterinary Medical Association, the horse doctors, the Horse Owners Associations around the country, who strongly support this amendment, correct, or are they correct?

I think this is a fair amendment, and I would urge my colleagues to adopt it.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I must say I am shocked that the gentleman would want to get the government involved in this kind of an issue. These are private property rights people who are out there voluntarily providing their property, their money to take care of these unwanted horses.

And one of the reasons we opposed this amendment, you talk about sufficient horse sanctuaries. We know who would be defining "sufficient." The Department of Agriculture, who must work with your committee to get anything that they want on the farm bill or anything else; so you would be dictating what is sufficient, and we know that there would never be enough sanctuaries sufficient to meet your demands.

So I would say once again we do not have to speculate about unwanted horses in the future. We know for a fact that unwanted horses is not a problem, as we have gone from 300,000 to 90,000 a year. No one has complained about it. No study has shown it. UC Davis in their study in California indicated that there have not been any additional increases of unwanted horses.

So I would urge every Member to oppose this amendment, which is designed to defeat this bill.

Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chairman, the additional amendments that have been made in order under my name or my designee we do not intend to bring up.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 109-642.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. KING of Iowa:

In the paragraph (8) of section 5 of the Horse Protection Act, which is being added by subsection (c)(2) of section 1 of the bill, strike "consumption." and insert the following: "consumption, unless the horse or other equine will be slaughtered for human consumption by Native Americans or persons of cultures who have traditionally consumed the meat of horses or other equines, as determined by the Secretary."

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 981, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Chairman, I am offering this amendment today that would allow a cultural exemption for Native Americans and people from cultures that consume equine meat.

Specifically, my amendment would permit equine to be shipped, transported, moved, delivered, received, possessed, purchased, sold, all of the list that is in the bill, Madam Chairman, by Native Americans or people from cultures who eat equine meat.

Horses have played, and continue to play, an important role in Native American culture. It is particularly true for the tribes of the Great Northern Plains, including the Great Sioux Nation. Many tribal members raise and sell horses. In addition, the Apache people and the Pueblo people from the Southwest have consumed horse meat. They were very skilled on horseback, but they valued and cherished the horse as food as well.

The Native American cultures are not the only people to eat or raise horses for meat. The people from the cultures of Japan, Belgium, France,

Austria, Quebec, Chile, Germany, Iceland, Kazakhstan, including also the Netherlands, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, and Italy, all eat horse meat today and all have recipes today.

People in support of this bill have a romantic view of the horse because it helped build America, and in their mind it is not in our culture to eat the horse for that reason. But they fail to understand that the oxen, bovine, was also a great assistance to us and maybe even a greater assistance in building America; but we do not have an aversion to beef, Madam Chairman.

So for these reasons, I would ask support for this cultural exemption amendment.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY) in opposition.

Mr. SWEENEY. Madam Chairman, there are two giant loopholes created here, and I will submit for the RECORD statements by a number of Indian tribes, the Great Plains Tribal Chairman's Association, the Inter-Tribal Council of Nevada, and the National Congress of American Indians, in opposition to this amendment.

GREAT PLAINS

TRIBAL CHAIRMAN'S ASSOCIATION,
Eagle Butte, SD, September 6, 2006.

RESOLUTION OF THE GREAT PLAINS TRIBAL CHAIRMAN'S ASSOCIATION

Whereas, the Great Plains (formerly Aberdeen Area) Tribal Chairman's Association (GPTCA) is composed of the elected Chairs and Presidents of the sovereign Indian Tribes and Nations recognized by Treaties with the United States that are within the Great Plains Region of the Bureau of Indian Affairs; and

Whereas, the Great Plains Tribal Chairman's Association was formed to promote the common interests of the sovereign Tribes and Nations and their members of the Great Plains Region; and

Whereas, the United States has obligated itself both through Treaties entered into with the sovereign Tribes and Nations of the Great Plains Region and through its own federal statutes, the Snyder Act of 1921 as amended, the Indian Self-Determination Act of 1976 as amended, and the Indian Health Care Improvement Act of 1976 as amended; and

Whereas, the Tribes of the Great Plains have strong spiritual, cultural, and historical ties to wild horses; and

Whereas, the Tribes of the Great Plains are disheartened and alarmed by the new language in Appropriations Bill H.R. 4818 that would allow the slaughter of these sacred animals; and

Whereas, the Tribes of the Great Plains are concerned that wild horses are fast disappearing and that soon there will not be sufficient numbers to sustain healthy populations; and

Whereas, the Tribes of the Great Plains recognize wild horses as one of the last living symbols that represent our ancestral past; and

Whereas, the wild horses have no one to speak for them and the Tribes of the Great Plains are compelled to step forward on behalf of the last remaining wild horses in the United States; and: Now, therefore be it

Resolved; That the Great Plains Tribal Chairman's Association opposes the slaugh-

ter of wild horses and supports adoption of wild horses with the federal government waiving the adoption fee and providing funds for transportation in order to prevent their slaughter; and: Now, therefore be it further

Resolved; That the Great Plains Tribes support and encourage the reintroduction and reinstitution of protective legislation in the 109th United States Congress to prevent wild horses and burros from being slaughtered and maintain a viable number of animals on the public lands; and: Now, be it finally

Resolved; The Great Plains Tribal Chairman's Association call upon other Tribes and Indian Nations to join with us in all efforts to find solutions for the preservation of wild horses.

NATIONAL CONGRESS OF AMERICAN INDIANS RESOLUTION

Whereas, we, the members of the National Congress of American Indians of the United States, invoking the divine blessing of the Creator upon our efforts and purposes, in order to preserve for ourselves and our descendants the inherent sovereign rights of our Indian nations, rights secured under Indian treaties and agreements with the United States, and all other rights and benefits to which we are entitled under the laws and Constitution of the United States, to enlighten the public toward a better understanding of the Indian people, to preserve Indian cultural values, and otherwise promote the health, safety and welfare of the Indian people, do hereby establish and submit the following resolution; and

Whereas, the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI) was established in 1944 and is the oldest and largest national organization of American Indian and Alaska Native tribal governments; and

Whereas, the NCAI recognizes that many of the Tribes have strong spiritual, cultural, and historic ties to wild horses; and

Whereas, the Tribes oral history remembers wild horses from ancient times and concurs that wild horses evolved on the North American continent for eons of time; and

Whereas, the NCAI acknowledges wild horses as one of the last living symbols that represent our ancestral past when people and animals were free to live and roam in harmony with Mother Earth; and

Whereas, the Tribes are disheartened and alarmed by the passage of the Burn's amendment to PL 92-195 that allows for the slaughter of these sacred animals; and

Whereas, the Tribes are concerned that wild horses are fast disappearing and that soon there will not be sufficient numbers to sustain healthy populations; and

Whereas, the wild horses have no one to speak for them and the Tribes of the NCAI are compelled to step forward on behalf of the last remaining wild horses in the United States; and: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the NCAI opposes the slaughter of wild horses and supports the relocation of wild horses to Tribal lands with the Department of the Interior waiving the adoption fee and not charging more than \$1.00 per animal and providing transportation of the animals at no charge to the accepting Tribes; and: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Tribes of the NCAI support and encourage the reintroduction and reinstitution of protective legislation in the 109th United States Congress to prevent wild horses and burros from being slaughtered and to maintain a viable number of animals on public lands; and: Now be it finally

Resolved, That the NCAI Tribes call upon other Tribes and Indian Nations to join us in all efforts to find solutions for the preservation of wild horses.

INTER-TRIBAL
COUNCIL OF NEVADA, INC.
Reno, NV, September 6, 2006.

RESOLUTION NO. 05-ITCN-02

Whereas, the Inter-Tribal Council of Nevada, Inc., is organized and operates in accordance with its Constitution and By-Laws, amended in November 1974; and

Whereas, the purposes of Inter-Tribal Council of Nevada, Inc. (ITCN), are stated in its Constitution, Preamble; and

Whereas, the Executive Board, a body comprised of the twenty-seven (27) elected representatives of the member tribes in the State of Nevada and whose charter is ratified by these same tribes; and

Whereas, the Inter-Tribal Council of Nevada has a continuing interest in the health, education and well-being of their Indian people; and

Whereas, the Nevada tribes are disheartened and alarmed by the new language in Appropriations Bill H.R. 4818 that would allow the slaughter of these sacred animals; Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Inter-Tribal Council of Nevada opposes the slaughter of wild horses and supports adoption of wild horses with the federal government waiving the adoption fee and providing funds for transportation in order to prevent their slaughter; and Be it further

Resolved, That the Inter-Tribal Council of Nevada supports and encourages the reintroduction and reinstitution of protective legislation in the 109th United States Congress to prevent wild horses and burros from being slaughtered and utilized for food consumption and maintain a viable number of animals on the public lands: Now be it finally

Resolved, That the Inter-Tribal Council of Nevada call upon other Tribes and Indian Nations to join with us in all efforts to find solutions for the preservation of wild horses.

Madam Chairman, the two loopholes are simply this: first, it would encourage the slaughter facilities to simply relocate to reservations and simply export the meat from there. This would allow the practice of slaughter to continue.

Secondly, the amendment gives "persons of cultures who have traditionally consumed the meat of horses" an exemption. It is not defined in the bill, Madam Chairman. These persons of cultures are not specified. The amendment offered, I understand, has given us some definition, saying essentially this bill would say the French, the Belgians, whomever else may continue this practice simply because it is part of their culture. It is not defined. And, therefore, I think it is inappropriate to have it in the bill. It is a poison pill for this bill, and I strongly oppose it.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Chairman, in response to the gentleman from New York, I would point out that I have a letter here from the United Sioux Tribes of South Dakota that I will introduce into the RECORD. And in this letter it says: "Horses have played, and continue to play, an important role in the Indian culture. That is particularly true for Tribes of the Great Northern Plains."

And it says: "Many tribal members raise and sell horses." This is currently, today. "Some of these horses are used for food and exported. It is inconceivable to think the Congress

might extinguish our property rights and lessen our income even more."

And I would point out to the gentleman from New York that we have in this amendment language that says it would be determined by the Secretary as to which cultural exemptions. So it is not simply a blanket exemption. I did not list the Irish in that, and maybe I am remiss in that. But I do not intend to build a record here of all of the cultures that have traditionally eaten horse meat, but there are many of them that do. They do so today. They have recipes today. And this is something that infringes upon people's property rights and their cultural rights. And if we are going to say this to the Native American people that we are going to pull these assets out from underneath you and you can't do with a horse what you have done for hundreds of years, I think that is a message that we are not going to want to send across America.

UNITED SIOUX TRIBES
OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
Pierre, SD, August 22, 2006.

Hon. STEPHANIE HERSETH,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Attention: Ryan Stroschein & Phil Assmus

DEAR STEPHANIE: We greatly appreciate your opposition to H.R. 503. This bill would, in short, prohibit the marketing of our horses to slaughter.

Horses have played, and continue to play, an important role in the Indian culture. That is particularly true for Tribes of the Northern Great Plains, including the Great Sioux Nation. The United States has taken our land and if this bill passes you will be taking our property without compensation.

Many tribal members raise and sell horses. Some of these horses are used for food and exported. It is inconceivable to think the Congress might extinguish our property rights and lessen our income even more. We urge you to ask your colleagues to follow your lead and oppose H.R. 503. Thank you.

Sincerely,

CLARENCE W. SKYE,
Executive Director.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment.

I would also submit for the RECORD a letter that we have from Chief Arvol of the Lakota Nation, and he wrote a very long letter in opposition to this amendment. He says: "I am writing to ask for your support in co-sponsoring the American Horse Slaughter Prevention Act and for our tribe."

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: My name is Chief Arvol Looking Horse of the Lakota, Dakota, Nakota Nation. I am also known as "Sung Wakan" (Horse Man). My position with my People is the 19th Generation Keeper of the Sacred White Buffalo Calf Bundle. I am the spiritual leader for our Nation.

It has been recorded in ancient petroglyphs and in our oral stories that the horse nation was around our people long before the Spaniards brought the other relative of the horse nation to this land. These ancient horses were much smaller in size and not so much in numbers, to a point of extinction.

With this ancient Bundle, almost 2,000 years old, existed a horse ceremony acknowledging the horse nation in respect to their wise and gentle spirit, as they offered a gift

of healing for our own human spirit. My work has involved many efforts in bringing awareness to the importance to all life upon Mother Earth, including Mother Earth herself so that all life may live in Peace. I was raised with the understanding that all forms of life have their own meaning of importance and should not be taken for granted. To ignore and not to try to learn this precious truth of all living beings to live in Peace with us as humans of power and decisions, will affect the lives of our own children in their health of body mind and spirit. We need to teach all children to look at all life as sacred.

The Horse Nation is an important spirit being. The Nation deserves the protection and awareness of what we humans can offer. They have saved, assisted, and given of themselves for all humans throughout history. Whether it was being ridden in battles, or in traveling, and most recently discovered by therapists through friendship, they can give healing to our troubled spirits. The Native Nations always understood these gifts and that was why we had our horse dance ceremony.

This awareness of the horse's gifts to humans has transformed into a strong respect. This awareness has been gathering People from the country to protect this fine spirit from a very negative attack on their health and existence, by unconscious disrespectful humans in the name of greed. A horse can feel impending trauma in their environment. Yet, horses trust humans and so are being led to slaughter.

This is not a way of respecting life that children need to learn, as we adults having positions as role models and leaders in our communities. This energy, as we understand these actions to be, will indeed backfire, if people do not educate themselves about the importance of the different spiritual roles of all life forms. Some animal nations, indeed, give themselves for food. They actually know their purpose in the human's food chain, as long as humans understand this with respect. We should understand the Horse Nation has earned the right to live in Peace for what they have contributed to all our lives throughout history.

I am writing to ask for your support in co-sponsoring the American Horse Slaughter Prevention Act. The AHSPA (H.R. 857) has been introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives by Representative John Sweeney (R-NY) who is chair of the Congressional Horse Caucus and Congressman John Spratt (D-SC). A similar bill will soon be before the U.S. Senate.

Despite the passage of the Wild-Free Roaming Wild Horses and Burros Act of 1971 which was enacted to protect the wild horse from slaughter, hundreds, perhaps thousands, continue to be slaughtered each year. The Bureau of Land Management removed too many wild horses from their ranges resulting in ongoing sales to the slaughterhouses. If you wish to learn more about these activities, please contact Chris Heyde of the Society for Animal Protective Legislation.

In a Sacred Hoop of life, where there is no ending and no beginning!

Thank you for your attention to this effort.

Mitakuye Oyasin (All my relations),
Chief ARVOL LOOKING HORSE,
*19th Generation Keeper of
the Sacred White Buffalo Calf Pipe.*

Madam Chairman, the purpose of H.R. 503 has never been to dictate to other cultures what they can and cannot eat. The purpose of H.R. 503 is simply to prohibit the French, the Belgians, the Dutch from offering slaughterhouses in America, taking our

horses, many of which are stolen, obtained by misrepresentation, and shipping the meat to France, Belgium, and Japan.

So this amendment would do one thing. It would make the bill ineffective. It would defeat the bill in its entirety. And so I would urge the Members to oppose this amendment.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Madam Chairman, in this position that we are in today, to be objective in our perspective about how we deal with this issue, I don't know that there is a precedent in America that we have told an entire country no matter what your culture, no matter what your beliefs, no matter what your traditions, we do not want them here in this country. There are many other elements of other cultures that this civilization would be more healthy without, and yet there is not a single piece of legislation before this body that would define those components of another culture and rip them out and say, in our best judgment we think you ought to quit doing these things.

We accept all beliefs in America. That is part of who we are. Freedom of speech, religion, press, all of our cultural composition comes with all immigrants into this country and with the Native Americans too. And this amendment says to the Native Americans specifically and other cultures inclusively, if certified by the Secretary, we are going to accept your beliefs. We are going to accept your traditions. It is part of who we are as America to blend all those cultures and those civilizations together and come out with this robust nature of our great American culture, and that is what this amendment is about. It is about protecting our traditional values.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Madam Chairman, I very much thank the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky for yielding.

I oppose this amendment because it is not about Native Americans. It is about creating one more loophole. And I oppose the other amendments because they would undermine the intent of this bill.

We cannot be a Nation or a society that reduces everything to dollars and cents, that commoditizes everything. When you see an eagle take wing and soar above the clouds, that is not a commodity. It is a source of inspiration. When you see a horse galloping gracefully across the plains, that is not a commodity. That is a source of inspiration.

Horses have been part of the strength of this country for 400 years. We depended upon the horse. We explored this continent. Our commerce was

heavily dependent upon the horse. So many major battles where we prevailed were on horses.

Look at our monuments. Look at the monument in front of the Capitol. It is a horse. And when the horse has one leg up, it means that that person was wounded in battle. But there has been an intrinsic relationship.

Everything cannot be reduced to economics. We need to be inspired by some things, and these amendments would gut a bill that says there is no reason to be slaughtering horses. Three major slaughterhouses owned by foreign nations. Americans don't want to consume meat. Listen to the mayor of the city in Texas. It has ruined her economy. It is a stench. No one wants it. This is not about economics. This is about doing the right thing. And we have been tied to the horse, the eagle. These symbols of American strength, of American greatness, are sources of inspiration.

My very good friend Mr. WHITFIELD understands what this is really about. This is about preserving a symbol. We cannot allow the kind of slaughtering that takes place. More than 100,000 horses. Imagine. And the fact is they are slaughtering the healthy, fatter horses that have been well taken care of. They do not want the infirm, the old, the lame horses. That is not who they want to slaughter. So many of these arguments have been false arguments.

□ 1400

This amendment is doing the right thing. The Department of Agriculture circumvented the right thing that we have already passed. I support Mr. WHITFIELD. Let's pass this amendment.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Chairman, does he have the right to close or do I have the right to close?

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mrs. CAPITO). The gentleman from Kentucky has the right to close.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Madam Chair, I would reiterate that this amendment is about the cultural exemption to horse slaughter and consumption for human purposes. And this is something that has gone on in this country for hundreds of years.

Since the Spaniards brought the horses here, there have been horses consumed for human consumption. It has been part of the plan, part of the breeding, part of the raising, part of the feeding and part of the strategy.

In fact, as I stand here today, this date here in September is almost very close to the date that, 200 years ago, Lewis and Clark returned, back down the Missouri River. It was in September of 1806. They bought horses from the Native Americans out west for the purposes of taking those horses as pack horses up into the mountains. They knew they would not need those

horses when they got to the end of the line. And they bought those horses. Part of their strategy when they left St. Louis was, buy horses in that region and when you are finished working them, eat them. Louis and Clark ate horses. All of these ethnicities and countries that I have named all eat horses.

I do not think there is an ethnicity that has been exempt from having horses in their diet, but particularly Native Americans who, the Great Plains Native Americans, the Sioux Nation, and I represent Sioux County, and I represent two reservations in my district that I have had for over 10 years now, or almost 10 years now; all of those cultures are rooted in this. We need to provide a cultural exemption, Madam Chairman. If we send this message off to Native Americans, in particular, that we would not even let the Secretary of Agriculture designate an exemption for Native Americans no matter how long their tradition is, that will be an insult to Native Americans, an insult to multiculturalism in America. I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Chairman, I would just say that this bill certainly does not prevent individual owners from slaughtering a horse and eating the horse if they want to. I think that this amendment is unnecessary. It would defeat the purpose of the bill. All the correspondence we have had with Indian tribes indicates that they do not eat horse meat.

Horses have not been a part of the food chain in America. I would urge the defeat of the amendment and passage of H.R. 503.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment in my capacity as the Ranking Member of the Resources Committee which has legislative jurisdiction over Indian Affairs.

This amendment is an insult to Indian Country. It suggests that Native Americans consume horse flesh. And in doing so, it is derivative of their culture and their society.

The fact of the matter is that Indians do not eat horse flesh, and the three horse slaughter operations in this country do not sell horse flesh to Indians.

The meat of slaughtered horses is all exported by these slaughterhouses to foreign markets.

Indeed, I have before me resolution after resolution from Indian Country opposing the slaughter of horses, including from the National Congress of American Indians.

But to be clear, there is another purpose behind this amendment, because it seeks to also allow horses to be slaughtered for the consumption of people from cultures that eat equine meat. As a general matter.

The fact of the matter is that all of the meat from American slaughtered horses is consumed in European or Asian countries by people who traditionally eat horse flesh.

Adoption of this amendment would gut the pending legislation. It would render it null and void.

My colleagues, do not be fooled, do not be lulled into complacency by the attempt of this amendment to garner sympathy for Native Americans, when no such sympathy is required.

A vote for this amendment is the same as a vote against final passage of H.R. 503.

I urge the defeat of the pending amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. GOODLATTE of Virginia.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. KING of Iowa.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for the second electronic vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 177, noes 229, answered “present” 1, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 431]

AYES—177

Akin	Bradley (NH)	Davis (TN)
Alexander	Brady (TX)	Deal (GA)
Baca	Brown-Waite,	Dingell
Bachus	Ginny	Doolittle
Baker	Burgess	Drake
Barrett (SC)	Butterfield	Duncan
Barrow	Buyer	Edwards
Barton (TX)	Camp (MI)	Ehlers
Berry	Cannon	Emerson
Bishop (GA)	Cantor	Etheridge
Bishop (UT)	Cardoza	Everett
Blackburn	Carter	Feeney
Blunt	Chocola	Filner
Boehlert	Coble	Flake
Boehner	Cole (OK)	Ford
Bonilla	Conaway	Fortenberry
Bonner	Cooper	Fox
Boozman	Costa	Franks (AZ)
Boren	Cramer	Garrett (NJ)
Boswell	Cubin	Gillmor
Boucher	Cuellar	Gingrey
Boustany	Culberson	Gohmert
Boyd	Davis (KY)	Goode

Goodlatte	Marshall	Rehberg	Sanders	Snyder	Walsh
Gordon	Matheson	Reyes	Saxton	Solis	Wasserman
Granger	McCaul (TX)	Rogers (AL)	Schakowsky	Spratt	Schultz
Graves	McCrery	Rohrabacher	Schiff	Stark	Waters
Gutknecht	McDermott	Ross	Schmidt	Sweeney	Watson
Hart	McHenry	Rush	Schwartz (PA)	Tanner	Waxman
Hastings (FL)	McHugh	Ryan (WI)	Scott (GA)	Tauscher	Weiner
Hastings (WA)	McIntyre	Ryun (KS)	Scott (VA)	Taylor (MS)	Weldon (PA)
Hayes	McKeon	Salazar	Serrano	Thompson (CA)	Weller
Hefley	McMorris	Schwarz (MI)	Shaw	Thompson (MS)	Wexler
Hensarling	Rodgers	Sensenbrenner	Shays	Tierney	Whitfield
Herger	Melancon	Sessions	Sherman	Turner	Wilson (SC)
Herseth	Mica	Shadegg	Shuster	Udall (NM)	Wolf
Hinojosa	Miller (MI)	Sherwood	Simmons	Upton	Woolsey
Hobson	Moran (KS)	Shimkus	Slaughter	Van Hollen	Wu
Holden	Murtha	Simpson	Smith (NJ)	Velázquez	Wynn
Honda	Musgrave	Skelton	Smith (WA)	Visclosky	Young (FL)
Hulshof	Myrick	Smith (TX)			
Jenkins	Neugebauer	Sodrel			
Kennedy (MN)	Northup	Souder			
Kind	Norwood	Stearns			
King (IA)	Oberstar	Stupak			
Kingston	Ortiz	Sullivan			
Knollenberg	Osborne	Tancredo			
Kolbe	Otter	Taylor (NC)			
Kuhl (NY)	Pastor	Terry			
LaHood	Pearce	Thomas			
Larsen (WA)	Pence	Thornberry			
Latham	Peterson (MN)	Tiahrt			
Lewis (CA)	Peterson (PA)	Tiberi			
Lewis (KY)	Petri	Udall (CO)			
Lucas	Pickering	Walden (OR)			
Lungren, Daniel	Poe	Wamp			
E.	Pombo	Weldon (FL)			
Mack	Pomeroy	Westmoreland			
Manzullo	Putnam	Wicker			
Marchant	Radanovich	Wilson (NM)			

NOES—229

Abercrombie	English (PA)	Leach
Ackerman	Eshoo	Lee
Aderholt	Farr	Levin
Allen	Fattah	Lewis (GA)
Andrews	Ferguson	Linder
Baird	Fitzpatrick (PA)	Lipinski
Baldwin	Foley	LoBiondo
Bartlett (MD)	Forbes	Lofgren, Zoe
Bass	Fossella	Lowe
Bean	Frank (MA)	Lynch
Becerra	Frelinghuysen	Maloney
Berkley	Gerlach	Markey
Berman	Gibbons	Matsui
Biggert	Gilchrest	McCarthy
Bilbray	Gonzalez	McCollum (MN)
Bishop (NY)	Green, Al	McCotter
Blumenauer	Green, Gene	McGovern
Bono	Grijalva	McNulty
Brady (PA)	Gutierrez	Meehan
Brown (OH)	Hall	Meek (FL)
Brown (SC)	Harman	Meeks (NY)
Brown, Corrine	Hayworth	Michaud
Burton (IN)	Higgins	Miller (NC)
Calvert	Hinche	Miller, George
Campbell (CA)	Hoekstra	Mollohan
Capito	Holt	Moore (KS)
Capps	Hooley	Moore (WI)
Capuano	Hostettler	Moran (VA)
Cardin	Hoyer	Napolitano
Carnahan	Hunter	Neal (MA)
Carson	Hyde	Ney
Case	Inglis (SC)	Oliver
Castle	Inslee	Owens
Chabot	Israel	Pallone
Chandler	Issa	Pascarell
Clay	Jackson (IL)	Paul
Cleaver	Jackson-Lee	Payne
Clyburn	(TX)	Pelosi
Conyers	Jefferson	Pitts
Costello	Jindal	Platts
Crenshaw	Johnson (CT)	Porter
Crowley	Johnson (IL)	Price (GA)
Davis (AL)	Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)
Davis (CA)	Jones (NC)	Pryce (OH)
Davis (FL)	Jones (OH)	Rahall
Davis (IL)	Kanjorski	Ramstad
Davis, Jo Ann	Kaptur	Regula
Davis, Tom	Keller	Reichert
DeFazio	Kelly	Renzi
DeGette	Kennedy (RI)	Reynolds
Delahunt	Kildee	Rogers (KY)
DeLauro	Kilpatrick (MI)	Rogers (MI)
Dent	King (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kirk	Rothman
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kline	Roybal-Allard
Dicks	Kucinich	Royce
Doggett	Langvin	Ruppersberger
Dreier	Lantos	Ryan (OH)
Emanuel	Larson (CT)	Sabo
Engel	LaTourette	Sanchez, Loretta

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Obey

NOT VOTING—25

Beauprez	Johnson, Sam	Nussle
Bilirakis	McKinney	Oxley
Cummings	Millender-	Rangel
Doyle	McDonald	Sánchez, Linda
Evans	Miller (FL)	T.
Gallegly	Miller, Gary	Strickland
Green (WI)	Murphy	Towns
Harris	Nadler	Watt
Istook	Nunes	Young (AK)

□ 1432

Mrs. BIGGERT and Messrs. WYNN, PRICE of Georgia and CLEAVER changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. MCHUGH, FORD, OSBORNE, KUHLE of New York, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. GOODE, and Mr. AKIN changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 431, had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 149, noes 256, answered “present” 1, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 432]

AYES—149

Akin	Bonner	Cardoza
Baca	Boozman	Carter
Baker	Boren	Chocola
Barrow	Boswell	Cleaver
Barton (TX)	Boustany	Coble
Berry	Boyd	Cole (OK)
Bishop (GA)	Brady (TX)	Conaway
Bishop (UT)	Brown-Waite,	Cooper
Blackburn	Ginny	Costa
Blunt	Butterfield	Cubin
Boehlert	Buyer	Cuellar
Boehner	Camp (MI)	Culberson
Bonilla	Cannon	Davis (KY)

Davis (TN) Kuhl (NY) Pombo
Deal (GA) LaHood Pomeroy
Dingell Larsen (WA) Putnam
Doolittle Latham Radanovich
Drake Lewis (CA) Rehberg
Duncan Lucas Rogers (AL)
Edwards Mack Rohrabacher
Emerson Manzullo Ross
Etheridge Marchant Ryan (WI)
Feeney Marshall Ryun (KS)
Flake Matheson Salazar
Fortenberry McCaul (TX)
Foxy McCreery Schwarz (MI)
Franks (AZ) McHenry Sensenbrenner
Garrett (NJ) McHugh Sessions
Gingrey McKeon Shadegg
Goodlatte McMorris Sherwood
Gordon Rodgers Shimkus
Granger Melancon Simpson
Graves Mica Skelton
Gutknecht Miller (MI)
Hart Moran (KS) Smith (TX)
Hastings (FL) Musgrave Snyder
Hastings (WA) Neugebauer Sodrel
Hayes Northup Souder
Hefley Norwood Stearns
Herger Oberstar Stupak
Herseth Ortiz Sullivan
Hinojosa Osborne Tancredo
Honda Otter Terry
Hulshof Pastor Thomas
Jenkins Paul Thornberry
Kennedy (MN) Pearce Tiahrt
Kind Pence Walden (OR)
King (IA) Peterson (PA) Wamp
Kingston Petri Weldon (FL)
Knollenberg Pickering Westmoreland
Kolbe Poe Wilson (NM)

NOES—256

Abercrombie DeLauro Johnson (IL)
Ackerman Dent Johnson, E. B.
Aderholt Diaz-Balart, L. Jones (NC)
Alexander Diaz-Balart, M. Jones (OH)
Allen Dicks Kanjorski
Andrews Doggett Kaptur
Bachus Dreier Keller
Baird Ehlers Kelly
Baldwin Emanuel Kennedy (RI)
Barrett (SC) Engel Kildee
Bartlett (MD) English (PA) Kilpatrick (MI)
Bass Eshoo King (NY)
Bean Everett Kirk
Becerra Farr Kline
Berkley Fattah Kucinich
Berman Ferguson Langevin
Biggert Filner Lantos
Bilbray Fitzpatrick (PA) Larson (CT)
Bishop (NY) Foley LaTourette
Blumenauer Forbes Leach
Bono Ford Lee
Boucher Fossella Levin
Bradley (NH) Frank (MA) Lewis (GA)
Brady (PA) Frelinghuysen Lewis (KY)
Brown (OH) Gerlach Linder
Brown (SC) Gibbons Lipinski
Brown, Corrine Gilchrest LoBiondo
Burgess Gillmor Lofgren, Zoe
Burton (IN) Gonzalez Lowey
Calvert Goode Lungren, Daniel
Campbell (CA) Green, Al E.
Cantor Green, Gene Lynch
Capito Grijalva Maloney
Capps Gutierrez Markey
Capuano Hall Matsui
Cardin Harman McCarthy
Carnahan Hayworth McCollum (MN)
Carson Hensarling McCotter
Case Higgins McDermott
Castle Hinchey McGovern
Chabot Hobson McIntyre
Chandler Hoekstra McNulty
Clay Holden Meehan
Clyburn Holt Meek (FL)
Conyers Conyers Meeks (NY)
Costello Hostettler Michaud
Cramer Hoyer Miller (NC)
Crenshaw Hunter Miller, George
Crowley Hyde Mollohan
Cummings Inglis (SC) Moore (KS)
Davis (AL) Inslee Moore (WI)
Davis (CA) Israel Moran (VA)
Davis (FL) Issa Murtha
Davis (IL) Jackson (IL) Myrick
Davis, Jo Ann Jackson-Lee Napolitano
Davis, Tom (TX) Neal (MA)
DeFazio Jefferson Ney
DeGette Jindal Olver
Delahunt Johnson (CT) Owens

Pallone Sanders Tierney
Pascrell Saxton Turner
Payne Schakowsky Udall (CO)
Peterson (MN) Schiff Udall (NM)
Pitts Schmidt Upton
Platts Schwartz (PA) Van Hollen
Porter Scott (GA) Velázquez
Price (GA) Scott (VA) Visclosky
Price (NC) Serrano Walsh
Pryce (OH) Shaw Wasserman
Rahall Shays Schultz
Ramstad Sherman Waters
Regula Shuster Watson
Reichert Simmons Waxman
Renzi Slaughter Weiner
Reyes Smith (NJ) Weldon (PA)
Reynolds Smith (WA) Weller
Rogers (KY) Solis Wexler
Rogers (MI) Spratt Whitfield
Ros-Lehtinen Stark Wicker
Rothman Sweeney Wilson (SC)
Roybal-Allard Tanner Wolf
Royce Tauscher Woolsey
Ruppersberger Taylor (MS) Wu
Rush Taylor (NC) Wynn
Ryan (OH) Thompson (CA) Young (FL)
Sabó Thompson (MS)
Sanchez, Loretta Tiberi

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Obey

NOT VOTING—26

Beauprez McKinney Pelosi
Bilirakis Millender Rangel
Doyle McDonald Sánchez, Linda
Evans Miller (FL) T.
Gallegly Miller, Gary Strickland
Gohmert Murphy Towns
Green (WI) Nadler Watt
Harris Nunes Young (AK)
Istook Nussle
Johnson, Sam Oxley

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1440

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina and Mr. MCINTYRE changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 432, the King of Iowa amendment, had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

(By unanimous consent, Mr. THOMAS was allowed to speak out of order.)

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF FORMER MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, BOB MATHIAS

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of Mr. COSTA, Mr. NUNES and myself, I would like to advise the House that this past week an individual passed away, a former Member of the House of Representatives.

Some of you didn't have the privilege of knowing him in person, but all of you knew of him. Bob Mathias as a 17-year-old high school student went to London and came home with a gold medal in the decathlon. Four years later, he went to Helsinki and came home with a gold medal in the decathlon. Bob Mathias was a member of this House from 1966 to 1974.

Bob Mathias thought of himself as an ordinary person. Could we please, in recognition of an extraordinary human being, offer a moment of silence?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Members will rise and observe a moment of silence.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. There being no other amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. REHBERG) having assumed the chair, Mr. SIMPSON, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 503) to amend the Horse Protection Act to prohibit the shipping, transporting, moving, delivering, receiving, possessing, purchasing, selling, or donation of horses and other equines to be slaughtered for human consumption, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 981, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on passage of H.R. 503 will be followed by 5-minute votes on the motion to instruct on H.R. 5122, and the motion to permit closed conference meetings on H.R. 5122.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 263, noes 146, answered “present” 1, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 433]

AYES—263

Abercrombie	Capuano	Ehlers
Ackerman	Cardin	Emanuel
Aderholt	Carnahan	Engel
Alexander	Carson	English (PA)
Allen	Case	Eshoo
Andrews	Castle	Etheridge
Baca	Chabot	Everett
Bachus	Chandler	Farr
Baird	Clay	Fattah
Baldwin	Cleaver	Ferguson
Barrett (SC)	Clyburn	Fitzpatrick (PA)
Bartlett (MD)	Conyers	Foley
Bass	Costello	Forbes
Bean	Cramer	Fossella
Becerra	Crenshaw	Frank (MA)
Berkley	Crowley	Frelinghuysen
Berman	Cummings	Gerlach
Biggert	Davis (AL)	Gibbons
Bilbray	Davis (CA)	Gilchrest
Bishop (NY)	Davis (FL)	Gillmor
Blumenauer	Davis (IL)	Gonzalez
Bono	Davis (KY)	Goode
Boucher	Davis, Jo Ann	Green, Al
Bradley (NH)	Davis, Tom	Green, Gene
Brady (PA)	DeFazio	Grijalva
Brown (OH)	DeGette	Gutierrez
Brown (SC)	Delahunt	Hall
Brown, Corrine	DeLauro	Harman
Burgess	Dent	Hart
Burton (IN)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hastings (FL)
Calvert	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hayworth
Campbell (CA)	Dicks	Hinchee
Capito	Doggett	Hobson
Capps	Dreier	Holt

Hooley McCollum (MN)
 Hostettler McCotter
 Hoyer McGovern
 Hunter McIntyre
 Hyde McNulty
 Inglis (SC) Meehan
 Inslee Meek (FL)
 Israel Meeks (NY)
 Issa Mica
 Jackson (IL) Michaud
 Jackson-Lee (TX) Millender-
 McDonald
 Jefferson Miller (NC)
 Jindal Miller, George
 Johnson (CT) Mollohan
 Johnson (IL) Moore (KS)
 Johnson, E. B. Moore (WI)
 Jones (NC) Moran (VA)
 Jones (OH) Murtha
 Kanjorski Myrick
 Kaptur Napolitano
 Keller Neal (MA)
 Kelly Ney
 Kennedy (MN) Northup
 Kennedy (RI) Oliver
 Kildee Ortiz
 Kilpatrick (MI) Owens
 King (NY) Pallone
 Kirk Pascarella
 Kline Payne
 Kucinich Pelosi
 Kuhl (NY) Pence
 Langevin Pitts
 Lantos Platts
 Larsen (WA) Porter
 Larson (CT) Price (NC)
 LaTourette Pryce (OH)
 Leach Rahall
 Lee Ramstad
 Levin Regula
 Lewis (GA) Reichert
 Lewis (KY) Renzi
 Linder Reyes
 Lipinski Reynolds
 LoBiondo Rogers (KY)
 Lofgren, Zoe Rogers (MI)
 Lowey Ros-Lehtinen
 Lungren, Daniel Rothman
 E. Roybal-Allard
 Lynch Royce
 Mack Rumpersberger
 Maloney Rush
 Markey Ryan (OH)
 Matsui Sabo
 McCarthy Sanchez, Loretta

NOES—146

Akin Duncan
 Baker Edwards
 Barrow Emerson
 Barton (TX) Feeney
 Berry Filner
 Bishop (GA) Flake
 Bishop (UT) Ford
 Blackburn Fortenberry
 Blunt Foxx
 Boehlert Franks (AZ)
 Boehner Garrett (NJ)
 Bonilla Gingrey
 Bonner Gohmert
 Boozman Goodlatte
 Boren Gordon
 Boswell Granger
 Boustany Graves
 Boyd Gutknecht
 Brady (TX) Hastings (WA)
 Brown-Waite, Ginny
 Butterfield Hensarling
 Buyer Herger
 Camp (MI) Herseth
 Cannon Higgins
 Cantor Hinojosa
 Cardoza Hoekstra
 Carter Holden
 Chocola Honda
 Coble Hulshof
 Cole (OK) Jenkins
 Conaway Kind
 Cooper King (IA)
 Costa Kingston
 Cubin Knollenberg
 Cuellar Kolbe
 Culberson LaHood
 Davis (TN) Latham
 Deal (GA) Lucas
 Dingell Manzullo
 Doolittle Marchant
 Drake Marshall

Sanders Saxton
 Schakowsky Schiff
 Schmidt Schmidt
 Schwartz (PA) Schwartz (TX)
 Scott (GA) Scott (VA)
 Scott (VA) Serrano
 Shaw Shaw
 Shays Shays
 Sherman Sherman
 Shuster Simmons
 Simmons Slaughter
 Smith (NJ) Smith (WA)
 Smith (WA) Solis
 Solis Spratt
 Spratt Stark
 Stark Stupak
 Stupak Sweeney
 Tauscher Tanner
 Taylor (MS) Taylor (NC)
 Taylor (NC) Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (CA) Thompson (MS)
 Tiberi Tierney
 Tierney Turner
 Turner Udall (NM)
 Upton Van Hollen
 Velázquez Velázquez
 Visclosky Walsh
 Walsh Wamp
 Wasserman Wasserman
 Schultz Schultz
 Waters Waters
 Watson Watson
 Watt Watt
 Waxman Waxman
 Weiner Weiner
 Weldon (PA) Weller
 Weller Wexler
 Wexler Whitfield
 Whitfield Wilson (SC)
 Wilson (SC) Wolf
 Wolf Woolsey
 Woolsey Wu
 Wu Wynn
 Wynn Young (FL)

Shadegg
 Sherwood
 Shimkus
 Simpson
 Skelton
 Smith (TX)
 Snyder
 Sodrel

Souder
 Stearns
 Sullivan
 Tancredo
 Terry
 Thomas
 Thornberry
 Tiahrt

Udall (CO)
 Walden (OR)
 Weldon (FL)
 Westmoreland
 Wicker
 Wilson (NM)

Clyburn
 Coble
 Cole (OK)
 Conaway
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Costa
 Costello
 Cramer
 Crenshaw
 Crowley
 Cubin
 Cuellar
 Culberson
 Cummings
 Davis (AL)
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (FL)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis (TN)
 Davis, Jo Ann
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Doolittle
 Drake
 Dreier
 Duncan
 Edwards
 Ehlers
 Emanuel
 Emerson
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Etheridge
 Everett
 Farr
 Fattah
 Filner
 Fitzpatrick (PA)
 Foley
 Forbes
 Ford
 Fortenberry
 Fossella
 Foxx
 Frank (MA)
 Gerlach
 Gibbons
 Gilchrest
 Gillmor
 Gohmert
 Gonzalez
 Goode
 Goodlatte
 Gordon
 Granger
 Graves
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Gutierrez
 Gutknecht
 Hall
 Harman
 Hart
 Hastings (FL)
 Hastings (WA)
 Hayes
 Hayworth
 Hefley
 Herger
 Herseth
 Higgins
 Hinchey
 Hinojosa
 Hobson
 Hoekstra
 Holden
 Holt
 Honda
 Hooley
 Hostettler
 Hoyer
 Hulshof
 Hyde
 Inglis (SC)
 Inslee
 Israel

Issa
 Jackson (IL)
 Jackson-Lee (TX)
 Jefferson
 Jenkins
 Jindal
 Johnson (CT)
 Johnson (IL)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Jones (NC)
 Jones (OH)
 Kanjorski
 Kaptur
 Keller
 Kelly
 Kennedy (MN)
 Kennedy (RI)
 Kildee
 Kilpatrick (MI)
 Kind
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Kirk
 Kline
 Kolbe
 Kucinich
 Kuhl (NY)
 LaHood
 Langevin
 Lantos
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Latham
 LaTourette
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowey
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Markey
 Marshall
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCarthy
 McCaul (TX)
 McCollum (MN)
 McCotter
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McHugh
 McIntyre
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McNulty
 Meehan
 Meek (FL)
 Meeks (NY)
 Melancon
 Mica
 Michaud
 Millender-
 McDonald
 Miller (MI)
 Miller (NC)
 Miller, George
 Mollohan
 Moore (KS)
 Moore (WI)
 Moran (KS)
 Moran (VA)
 Murphy
 Murtha
 Musgrave
 Myrick
 Napolitano
 Neal (MA)
 Ney
 Northup
 Norwood
 Oberstar
 Obey
 Oliver
 Ortiz
 Osborne
 Otter
 Owens
 Pallone

Pascarella
 Pastor
 Paul
 Payne
 Pearce
 Pelosi
 Peterson (MN)
 Peterson (PA)
 Petri
 Pickering
 Pitts
 Platts
 Poe
 Pombo
 Pomeroy
 Porter
 Price (GA)
 Price (NC)
 Pryce (OH)
 Radanovich
 Rahall
 Ramstad
 Regula
 Rehberg
 Reichert
 Renzi
 Reyes
 Reynolds
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rohrabacher
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Ross
 Rothman
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruppersberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Ryan (WI)
 Ryun (KS)
 Sabo
 Salazar
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sanders
 Saxton
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schmidt
 Schwartz (PA)
 Schwarz (MI)
 Scott (GA)
 Scott (VA)
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Shaw
 Shays
 Sherman
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simmons
 Simpson
 Skelton
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Snyder
 Sodrel
 Solis
 Souder
 Spratt
 Stark
 Stearns
 Stupak
 Sullivan
 Sweeney
 Tancredo
 Tanner
 Tauscher
 Taylor (MS)
 Taylor (NC)
 Terry
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Tiahrt
 Tiberi
 Tierney
 Turner
 Udall (CO)
 Udall (NM)
 Upton
 Van Hollen
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walden (OR)
 Walsh
 Wamp
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

NOT VOTING—22

Beauprez Johnson, Sam
 Bilirakis Lewis (CA)
 Doyle McKinney
 Evans Miller (FL)
 Gallegly Miller, Gary
 Green (WI) Nadler
 Harris Nunes
 Istook Nussle

□ 1501

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I regret that, because I was taking my children to their first day of school, I missed one vote on September 7, 2006. Had I been present I would have voted “yes” on H. Res. 981 (Providing for the consideration of the bill H.R. 503 to amend the Horse Protection Act to prohibit the shipping, transporting, moving, delivering, receiving, possessing, purchasing, selling, or donation of horses and other equines to be slaughtered for human consumption.).

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 5122, G.V. “SONNY” MONTGOMERY NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. EDWARDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ADERHOLT). The pending business is the vote on the motion to instruct on H.R. 5122 offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 374, nays 30, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 434]

YEAS—374

Abercrombie
 Ackerman
 Aderholt
 Akin
 Alexander
 Allen
 Andrews
 Baca
 Bachus
 Baird
 Baldwin
 Barrett (SC)
 Barrow
 Bartlett (MD)
 Barton (TX)
 Bass
 Bean
 Becerra
 Berkley
 Berman
 Berry
 Biggert
 Bilbray
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (NY)
 Bishop (UT)
 Blackburn
 Blumenauer
 Boehlert
 Bonilla
 Bonner
 Bono
 Boozman
 Boren
 Boswell
 Boucher
 Boustany
 Boyd
 Bradley (NH)
 Brady (PA)
 Brown (OH)
 Brown (SC)
 Brown, Corrine
 Brown-Waite, Ginny
 Burgess
 Burton (IN)
 Butterfield
 Calvert
 Camp (MI)
 Capito
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cardin
 Cardoza
 Carnahan
 Carson
 Carter
 Case
 Castle
 Chabot
 Chandler
 Chocola
 Clay
 Cleaver

Watson	Weller	Wilson (SC)
Watt	Westmoreland	Wolf
Waxman	Wexler	Woolsey
Weiner	Whitfield	Wu
Weldon (FL)	Wicker	Wynn
Weldon (PA)	Wilson (NM)	Young (FL)

NAYS—30

Baker	Frelinghuysen	McCrery
Brady (TX)	Garrett (NJ)	McHenry
Buyer	Gingrey	McKeon
Campbell (CA)	Hensarling	Neugebauer
Cannon	Hunter	Pence
Cantor	King (IA)	Rogers (MI)
Feeney	Knollenberg	Sessions
Ferguson	Linder	Shadegg
Flake	Mack	Thomas
Franks (AZ)	Marchant	Thornberry

NOT VOTING—28

Beauprez	Istook	Rangel
Bilirakis	Johnson, Sam	Royce
Blunt	McKinney	Sánchez, Linda
Boehner	Miller (FL)	T.
	Miller, Gary	Sherwood
English (PA)	Nadler	Slaughter
Evans	Nunes	Strickland
Gallegly	Nussle	Towns
Green (WI)	Oxley	Young (AK)
Harris	Putnam	

□ 1513

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated agains:

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 434 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

MOTION TO CLOSE CONFERENCE COMMITTEE MEETINGS ON H.R. 5122, G.V. “SONNY” MONTGOMERY NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007, WHEN CLASSIFIED NATIONAL SECURITY INFORMATION IS UNDER CONSIDERATION

Mrs. DRAKE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 12 of rule XXII, I move that meetings of the conference between the House and Senate on H.R. 5122 may be closed to the public at such times as classified national security information may be broached, provided that any sitting Member of Congress shall be entitled to attend any meeting of the conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule XXII, the motion is not debatable, and the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 397, nays 10, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 435]

YEAS—397

Abercrombie	Bartlett (MD)	Blunt
Ackerman	Barton (TX)	Boehlert
Aderholt	Bass	Boehner
Akin	Bean	Bonilla
Alexander	Becerra	Bonner
Allen	Berkley	Bono
Andrews	Berman	Boozman
Baca	Berry	Boren
Bachus	Biggart	Boswell
Baird	Bilbray	Boucher
Baker	Bishop (GA)	Boustany
Baldwin	Bishop (NY)	Boyd
Barrett (SC)	Bishop (UT)	Bradley (NH)
Barrow	Blackburn	Brady (PA)

Brady (TX)	Goode	McHenry	Shays	Tauscher	Wasserman
Brown (OH)	Goodlatte	McHugh	Sherman	Taylor (MS)	Schultz
Brown (SC)	Gordon	McIntyre	Sherwood	Taylor (NC)	Waters
Brown, Corrine	Granger	McKeon	Shimkus	Terry	Watson
Brown-Waite,	Graves	McMorris	Shuster	Thomas	Watt
Ginny	Green, Al	Rodgers	Simmons	Thompson (CA)	Waxman
Burgess	Grijalva	McNulty	Simpson	Thompson (MS)	Weiner
Burton (IN)	Gutierrez	Meehan	Skelton	Thornberry	Weldon (FL)
Butterfield	Gutknecht	Meek (FL)	Smith (NJ)	Tiahrt	Weldon (PA)
Buyer	Hall	Meeks (NY)	Smith (TX)	Tiberi	Weller
Calvert	Harman	Melancon	Smith (WA)	Tierney	Westmoreland
Camp (MI)	Hart	Mica	Snyder	Turner	Wexler
Campbell (CA)	Hastings (FL)	Michaud	Sodrel	Udall (CO)	Whitfield
Cannon	Hastings (WA)	Millender-	Solis	Udall (NM)	Wicker
Cantor	Hayes	McDonald	Souder	Upton	Wilson (NM)
Cantor	Hayworth	Miller (MI)	Spratt	Van Hollen	Wilson (SC)
Capito	Hefley	Miller (NC)	Stearns	Velázquez	Wolf
Capps	Hensarling	Mollohan	Stupak	Visclosky	Woolsey
Cardin	Herger	Moore (KS)	Sullivan	Walden (OR)	Wu
Cardoza	Herseeth	Moore (WI)	Sweeney	Walsh	Wynn
Carnahan	Higgins	Moran (KS)	Tancredo	Wamp	Young (FL)
Carson	Hinchey	Moran (VA)	Tanner		
Carter	Hinojosa	Murphy			
Case	Hobson	Murtha			
Castle	Hoekstra	Musgrave			
Chabot	Holden	Myrick			
Chandler	Holt	Napolitano			
Chocola	Hooley	Neal (MA)			
Clay	Hostettler	Neugebauer			
Cleaver	Hoyer	Ney			
Clyburn	Hulshof	Northup			
Coble	Hunter	Norwood			
Cole (OK)	Hyde	Oberstar			
Conaway	Inglis (SC)	Obey			
Conyers	Inslee	Olver			
Cooper	Israel	Ortiz			
Costa	Issa	Osborne			
Costello	Jackson (IL)	Otter			
Cramer	Jackson-Lee	Owens			
Crenshaw	(TX)	Pallone			
Crowley	Jefferson	Pascrell			
Cubin	Jenkins	Pastor			
Cuellar	Jindal	Paul			
Culberson	Johnson (CT)	Pearce			
Cummings	Johnson (IL)	Pelosi			
Davis (AL)	Johnson, E. B.	Pence			
Davis (CA)	Jones (NC)	Peterson (MN)			
Davis (FL)	Jones (OH)	Peterson (PA)			
Davis (IL)	Kanjorski	Petri			
Davis (KY)	Kaptur	Pickering			
Davis (TN)	Keller	Pitts			
Davis, Jo Ann	Kelly	Platts			
Davis, Tom	Kennedy (MN)	Poe			
Deal (GA)	Kennedy (RI)	Pombo			
DeGette	Kildee	Pomeroy			
Delahunt	Kilpatrick (MI)	Porter			
DeLauro	Kind	Price (GA)			
Dent	King (IA)	Price (NC)			
Diaz-Balart, L.	King (NY)	Pryce (OH)			
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kingston	Putnam			
Dicks	Kirk	Radanovich			
Dingell	Kline	Rahall			
Doggett	Knollenberg	Ramstad			
Doolittle	Kolbe	Regula			
Drake	Kuhl (NY)	Rehberg			
Dreier	LaHood	Reichert			
Duncan	Langevin	Renzi			
Edwards	Lantos	Reyes			
Ehlers	Larsen (WA)	Reynolds			
Emanuel	Larson (CT)	Rogers (AL)			
Emerson	Latham	Rogers (KY)			
Engel	LaTourette	Rogers (MI)			
Eshoo	Leach	Rohrabacher			
Etheridge	Levin	Ros-Lehtinen			
Everett	Lewis (CA)	Ross			
Farr	Lewis (KY)	Rothman			
Fattah	Linder	Roybal-Allard			
Feeney	Lipinski	Royce			
Ferguson	LoBiondo	Ruppersberger			
Filner	Loftgren, Zoe	Rush			
Fitzpatrick (PA)	Lowey	Ryan (OH)			
Flake	Lucas	Ryan (WI)			
Foley	Lungren, Daniel	Ryun (KS)			
Forbes	E.	Sabo			
Ford	Lynch	Salazar			
Fortenberry	Mack	Sanchez, Loretta			
Fossella	Maloney	Sanders			
Fox	Manzullo	Saxton			
Frank (MA)	Marchant	Schiff			
Franks (AZ)	Markey	Schmidt			
Frelinghuysen	Marshall	Schwartz (PA)			
Garrett (NJ)	Matheson	Schwarz (MI)			
Gerlach	Matsui	Scott (GA)			
Gibbons	McCarthy	Scott (VA)			
Gibbs	McCauley (TX)	Sensenbrenner			
Gingrey	McCollum (MN)	Serrano			
Gohmert	McCotter	Sessions			
Gonzalez	McCrery	Shadegg			
	McGovern	Shaw			

NAYS—10

Blumenauer	Lee	Schakowsky
DeFazio	Lewis (GA)	Stark
Honda	McDermott	
Kucinich	Miller, George	

NOT VOTING—25

Beauprez	Istook	Payne
Bilirakis	Johnson, Sam	Rangel
Doyle	McKinney	Sánchez, Linda
English (PA)	Miller (FL)	T.
Evans	Miller, Gary	Slaughter
Gallegly	Nadler	Strickland
Green (WI)	Nunes	Towns
Green, Gene	Nussle	Young (AK)
Harris	Oxley	

□ 1522

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from Washington on Thursday, September 7, 2006. As a result, I was not recorded for rollcall votes Nos. 430, 431, 432, 433, 434 and 435. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on rollcall Nos. 430, 433, 434, and 435. I would have voted “no” on rollcall Nos. 431 and 432.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from votes on September 6 and 7, 2006, due to personal illness. As a result, I was not recorded for a series of votes. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall votes 427, 428, 429, 430, 433, 434, and 435.

On rollcall votes 431 and 432, I would have voted “no.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. speaker, I was unable to be present for rollcall votes 434 and 435. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall vote 434 and “yea” on rollcall vote 435.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come, and I yield to my friend, Mr. BOEHNER, the majority leader.

Mr. BOEHNER. I want to thank my colleague from Maryland for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, next week the House will convene on Tuesday at 12:30 for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

We will consider a number of measures under the suspension of the rules next Tuesday. We expect to have a final list of those measures to Members' offices by tomorrow afternoon.

For the balance of the week, the House will consider on Wednesday the 5-year anniversary of 9/11, and we will have a resolution on the floor, and we will also begin consideration of H.R. 2965, the Federal Prison Industries Competition in Contracting Act.

On Thursday and Friday, we will complete consideration of the Federal Prison Industries bill, and we will consider a House resolution amending the House rules on earmark reform. I would also note that conference reports may be brought up at any time, and hope to see H.R. 5122, the Sonny Montgomery National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2007 conference report and I hope to see it passed next week. At this point, Members should anticipate that we will have votes on Friday.

I also have an announcement in terms of the schedule. Members have a schedule through September. It is expected that the House will not be back in session until the week of November 13. I do want Members to know that the House will be in session that week. I expect we will have votes on Monday the 13th and through that week. Anything further on the schedule beyond that time, I wish I could tell Members, but I don't know.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for bringing us up to date.

Am I to take it that when the gentleman indicated that the 29th would be the last day prior to the election, Members can still rely on that representation?

Mr. BOEHNER. That is correct.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that comment because there has been some discussion there may be another week, and we are glad to advise Members.

Mr. BOEHNER. Somebody else was having those discussions with themselves, not with me.

Mr. HOYER. That happens, I have noticed.

With respect to the schedule that you have just announced, would it be fair to conclude that if we do not have additional conference reports, and you indicate that you will take conference reports if they are available, which I understand, but if there were not additional conference reports beyond those which you have referenced in your announcement, that the probability of Friday is not as great as it otherwise would be? What I am saying, before you respond, is essentially it would appear to me that based upon what has been noticed, that that work would probably be accomplished within the Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday period.

Mr. BOEHNER. If the gentleman will yield, it is possible that the House could complete its work by Thursday night. It is possible. But I don't want to mislead Members. At this point, I believe that Members should expect votes on Friday. If it becomes clear during the week that we will be able to complete our work, I will give Members as much notice as possible. But I don't want to promise something that we can't deliver.

Mr. HOYER. I understand.

On the following Friday, the 22nd, as the gentleman knows, Rosh Hashanah begins at sundown on that day. That is the first day of Rosh Hashanah. One of the problems, as you know, that we have is Members getting back to the West Coast in time to observe Rosh Hashanah appropriately. Friday the 22nd is currently on the schedule. Can you comment on that?

Mr. BOEHNER. I will work with you to accommodate our Members who want to observe this religious holiday. I do understand the problem for Members on the West Coast. We will work with you to come to some resolution. We don't want to put any Members in a difficult travel position when it comes to observance of their religious holidays.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that, and we look forward to discussing that with you.

You note in the announcement of the 9/11 resolution, and I was asked by the press, were we going to do something on issues that appear to be partisan, and I said no. On September 11th, we will not be here; we will be in our home districts, and it should be a day of remembrance and resolve; remembrance of the heroism of that day and remembrance of the loss of life on that day, and resolve to defeat terrorism and to defeat those who would put our country at risk and put our people in harm's way and at risk. I believe we are united on that.

I just saw the resolution, and I have not had a chance to read the resolution, nor as I understand it have we worked with your side on the resolution.

Mr. Leader, I would hope perhaps we could come together before the resolution is finally introduced. We passed last year's resolution with over 400 votes, very few "no" votes. I ask if we could work on this together to ensure that we have that kind of unanimity which I think is appropriate and would help to bring us together.

Mr. BOEHNER. I have not had a chance to read the resolution either, and you have not read the resolution. All I do know is that both Democrats and Republicans have worked closely together to develop the resolution. Again, I will be happy to take a look at it. And I would suggest to the gentleman, if you have any suggestions or concerns, let me know.

□ 1530

Mr. HOYER. I thank the leader for that. And I did not know whether our

Democrats had worked with people on your side of the aisle. If that is the case, then when I read the resolution, I am sure I will be pleased. But if there are questions, I will bring them to the attention of the leader.

Mr. Leader, of course we have next week's schedule. Next week's schedule does not include the only appropriation bill that we have not yet passed. As you know, we have passed 10 out of the 11 appropriations bills. The Labor-Health bill was passed through the House Appropriations Committee and ready to report in June. So it has now been pending for approximately 60, 75 days.

Do you have any expectation that the Labor-Health bill will be brought to the floor within the foreseeable future?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. BOEHNER. The issue is under discussion. As the gentleman knows, there are a number of issues in that bill that have caused concern amongst Members. And while one of those appears to have been resolved, there are a number of other issues remaining there. There have been several discussions this week and I think there will be several more discussions next week about how to deal with that particular bill.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that observation. He refers to one or two of the issues in the bill. Obviously, one of the issues is the so-called Hoyer amendment, the Miller bill, which raises the minimum wage. We would hope that that would be brought to the floor. As you well know, we considered it with another bill. A number of items included in it. It went to the Senate. It didn't pass. We believe that the 6.6 million people on the minimum wage are hopeful that we will act before we leave here for the election.

I am very hopeful and I know our side is very hopeful that we could bring that bill to the floor with that amendment protected, voted up or down. If the Members think that we ought not to do it, fine. If the Members think we ought to do it, fine. And pass that bill to the Senate so we can complete the appropriations process.

Mr. BOEHNER. I think the gentleman is well aware that in July before the House went on its August district work period, the House voted to raise the minimum wage, and this bill is pending in the Senate and I am hopeful that the Senate will see fit to deal with it.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Leader, of course I appreciate your reiterating what we did and we all understand what we did. There are different perspectives on what we did. But I would reiterate this side's strong desire and hope that we would consider the issue of minimum wage on its own merits, as was done in the committee. As you know, it was passed in a bipartisan fashion in committee with one-fourth, I think, or maybe one-fifth of the Republicans in the committee voting for it.

Mr. BOEHNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I would be glad to yield to my friend.

Mr. BOEHNER. We have rules in the House about legislating on an appropriations bill, and it is clear that the intent of the author was to legislate on an appropriations bill. I think the majority did the right thing by moving the authorizing language for the minimum wage through the Rules Committee and brought it to the House floor.

So, again, the House has dealt with this. I am hopeful that the Senate will deal with it soon.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comment. I understand what the rules are, and both sides have relatively regularly waived those rules when it wanted to do something. And if we want to raise the minimum wage for our workers, we can do it. That is our perspective. But I certainly appreciate the gentleman's further education on what the rules require.

Let me ask you this. It is not on the schedule for next week. Do you anticipate any additional legislation prior to the 29th of September which would further implement the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission? As you know, there are some 19 recommendations which Governor Kean and Congressman Hamilton have observed we have not acted on. Can you tell us whether there is any anticipation of scheduling action on those issues?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. BOEHNER. Over a year ago, the House worked to implement the recommendations of the bipartisan 9/11 Commission. And I believe that Members on both sides of the Capitol, on both sides of the aisle, decided to accept those recommendations that we thought would be helpful. Not all of the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission have, in fact, been adopted because, as I understand it, Members on both sides of the aisle and on both sides of the Capitol have rejected some of the ideas that they put forth.

As we all know, some of these independent commissions get established. They can make recommendations, but the real decisions about what we should enact into law should be left to the Members, and I think the Members have made their decisions very clear.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his observations, while I think we disagree on the substance of the reports and the merits of the recommendations that have not yet been passed. I know on our side, Mr. THOMPSON, who is our ranking member on the Homeland Security Committee, and others are very hopeful that we can move forward on those. But I understand what the gentleman has said.

I will not ask the gentleman further questions. But, Mr. Speaker, under my reservation I would say that we on this side of the aisle are very hopeful that we can consider legislation before we break on the 29th of September which

would give the Secretary of Health and Human Services the authority to negotiate lower prescription drug prices for our seniors. We would hope that we would see legislation which would restore the deep cuts in college tuition assistance that were included in the deficit reduction bill that we passed some months ago and that we would reconsider the tax cuts that we gave, deep tax cuts, that we gave to oil companies apparently to spur further investment in exploration for new sources of oil. A worthy objective. But I think, happily or unhappily, depending upon your perspective, whether you are an oil company or whether you are a driver of automobiles and have to pay the gasoline prices, the companies are making great profits and could have great incentive because of those great profits to develop further sources of energy.

I would conclude by saying that we would hope the majority would seriously consider bringing to the floor all of those issues prior to the 29th.

Mr. BOEHNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to my friend, the majority leader.

Mr. BOEHNER. Just so the gentleman understands, and I appreciate his yielding, I am happy to come here and have this colloquy with you about what is going to be on the floor and give you as much information as I can.

Now, I see that my friend from Maryland today has decided to employ a new tactic in bringing campaign themes to the floor during the colloquy. Now, I would be happy to engage in those, but it is not what the colloquy is for. And so I would be happy to engage the gentleman.

The Medicare drug bill has produced premiums for seniors far below, far below, any number that anyone ever expected. And what got us those low drug premium prices was the competition that was created in the creation of the program.

Secondly, when it comes to the college loan program that the gentleman referred to that there were cuts, if the gentleman would look at the bill, he will realize that we widened the ability of more students to get to college under this program than we have ever had. The fact is there are higher numbers for grant programs, higher numbers for what you can borrow from the program, and it could not be working any better. And as a result, the Deficit Reduction Act that we passed last year did, in fact, save \$12.5 billion that came out of the hides of the lenders who were involved in the program.

So, again, I would be happy to engage you in this conversation, but we could probably do it under a Special Order rather than during the colloquy.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his observations, and perhaps I will take him up on that offer. That might be instructive for both of us and perhaps for the American people as well. I under-

stand the gentleman's perspective. We differ. That is not surprising, I am sure, to the viewers.

But I will say this, Mr. Leader, if I can, that this is about discussing the schedule. We have a very short time frame. We have 14 days left that are scheduled in this session before the election, and we are coming back for a lame duck session. I understand that. But I was simply inquiring of you whether or not those matters which we believe are important might be on the schedule. I am not debating their merits or demerits at this point in time. I can do that and, as a matter of fact, look forward to discussing that in a Special Order with you. But we do believe it was in the realm of a discussion about what might be scheduled.

And I yield to my friend.

Mr. BOEHNER. I thank my colleague. And while we may differ on whether the glass is half full or half empty, I do have great respect for my colleague from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW AND ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 2006, TO TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 2006

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. tomorrow and further, that when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, September 12, 2006, for morning hour debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMPBELL of California). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2965, FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES COMPETITION IN CONTRACTING ACT

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules may meet the week of September 11 to grant a rule which could limit the amendment process for floor consideration of H.R. 2965, the Federal Prison Industries Competition in Contracting Act.

Any Member wishing to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies of the amendment and one copy of a brief explanation of the amendment to the

Rules Committee in room H-312 of the Capitol by noon on Tuesday, September 12, 2006. Members should draft their amendments to the bill as ordered reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, which was filed with the House on July 21, 2006.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are drafted in the most appropriate format, and they should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain that their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 5122, G.V. "SONNY" MONTGOMERY NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees:

From the Committee on Armed Services, for consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. HUNTER, WELDON of Pennsylvania, HEFLEY, SAXTON, McHUGH, EVERETT, BARTLETT of Maryland, THORNBERRY, HOSTETTLER, JONES of North Carolina, RYUN of Kansas, GIBBONS, HAYES, CALVERT, SIMMONS, Mrs. DRAKE, Messrs. DAVIS of Kentucky, SKELTON, SPRATT, ORTIZ, TAYLOR of Mississippi, ABERCROMBIE, MEEHAN, REYES, SNYDER, SMITH of Washington, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. ANDREWS.

From the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, for consideration of matters within the jurisdiction of that committee under clause 11 of rule X: Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. LAHOOD, and Ms. HARMAN.

From the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for consideration of sections 571 and 572 of the House bill, and sections 571, 572, 1081, and 1104 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. McKEON, KLINE, and GEORGE MILLER of California.

From the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for consideration of sections 314, 601, 602, 710, 3115, 3117, and 3201 of the House bill, and sections 332-335, 352, 601, 722, 2842, 3115, and 3201 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. BARTON of Texas, GILLMOR, and DINGELL.

From the Committee on Government Reform, for consideration of sections 343, 721, 811, 823, 824, 1103, 1104, and 3115 of the House bill, and sections 371, 619, 806, 823, 922, 1007, 1043, 1054, 1088, 1089, 1101, and 3115 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, SHAYS, and WAXMAN.

From the Committee on Homeland Security, for consideration of section 1026 of the House bill, and section 1044 of the Senate amendment, and modi-

fications committed to conference: Messrs. KING of New York, REICHERT, and THOMPSON of Mississippi.

From the Committee on International Relations, for consideration of sections 1021-1023, 1201-1204, 1206, title XIII, sections 3113 and 3114 of the House bill, and sections 1014, 1021-1023, 1054, 1092, 1201-1208, 1210, 1214, title XIII, sections 3112 and 3113 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. HYDE, LEACH, and LANTOS.

From the Committee on the Judiciary, for consideration of section 1021 of the House bill, and sections 666, 1044, 1086, 1089, 1091, and 1094 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. SENSENBRENNER, COBLE, and CONYERS.

From the Committee on Resources, for consideration of sections 601, 602, and 1036 of the House bill, and section 601 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. POMBO, WALDEN of Oregon, and GRIJALVA.

From the Committee on Science, for consideration of sections 312 and 911 of the House bill, and sections 333, 874, and 1082 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. BOEHLERT, SODREL, and GORDON.

From the Committee on Small Business, for consideration of sections 874 and 1093 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. MANZULLO, Mrs. KELLY, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

From the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for consideration of sections 312, 551, 601, 602, and 2845 of the House bill, and sections 333, 584, 601, 1042, 1095, 2842, 2851-2853, and 2855 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. YOUNG of Alaska, LOBIONDO, and OBERSTAR.

From the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for consideration of sections 666, 682, 683, 687, 721, and 923 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. BUYER, BOOZMAN, and Ms. HERSETH.

There was no objection.

□ 1545

HONORING THE AHWATUKEE ALL-STARS

(Mr. HAYWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it is a ritual of the school year where millions of American students return to class and offer an essay entitled, "What I Did on My Summer Vacation."

Mr. Speaker, for a special group of 11-, 12- and 13-year-olds from the Fifth Congressional District of Arizona, it is quite a daunting challenge, because, Mr. Speaker, that select group of young men, nicknamed The Dawgs, the all-stars of Ahwatukee's Little League

advanced all the way to the Little League World Series in Williamsport, Pennsylvania.

This special team went out as winners. They won their final game but due to a rule for a tie-breaker had the unfortunate experience of not advancing. In fact, of the nine teams that won two games at Williamsport, sadly only the team from Ahwatukee did not advance. But they are more than exceptions, Mr. Speaker; they are true champions, not only the best in the west but a team that went out winners in Williamsport.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the roster of this team and their championship season and would remark as I close, Mr. Speaker, with the observation that they have now entered the history of this House as well as the history of the Little League World Series.

ROSTER FOR AHWATUKEE DAWGS

#18 Michael Anderson, #16 Eric Camarillo, #3 Shaun Chase, #5 Max Harden, #9 Justin Hyden, #44 David Hulls, #11 Connor Kelly, #25 Sam Kingery, #17 Scott Kingery, #14 Chase Knox, #7 Ryan Modi, and #10 Hunter Rodriguez.

Overall Record: 4 Tournaments, 22-2.

Record in Williamsport: 2-1. Dawgs vs. Lemont, Illinois 1-0 (Win); Dawgs vs. Columbus, Georgia 4-1 (Loss); and Dawgs vs. Staten Island, New York 4-1 (Win).

TRUTH SQUAD ON WASTE, FRAUD AND ABUSE

(Mr. CARDOZA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, the Truth Squad on Waste, Fraud and Abuse is charged with holding the Bush administration accountable for its mis-handling of taxpayer dollars.

That is something that this Republican Congress has failed to do. On issue after issue, from Katrina to Iraq to border security, to health care, we have seen outrageous waste of American tax dollars. And this Congress has repeatedly failed to hold the administration accountable for it.

Today, the Truth Squad is unveiling the Golden Drain Award, which you see next to me in this picture. The Golden Drain is an award that will be displayed in my office, and it will be given each week to a recipient who has been most derelict in their duty as stewards of American taxpayer dollars. We will award this award next week for the first time.

All told, the Truth Squad has identified over \$150 billion of American tax dollars that have gone down the drain of waste, fraud and abuse. Enough is enough, Mr. Speaker. It is time for accountability. It is time for a new direction. It is time to audit America's books.

NO AMNESTY FOR ILLEGAL ALIENS

(Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida asked and was given permission to

address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Americans are frustrated. Back in May, the Senate passed the "No Illegal Alien Left Behind" bill which hands rights and benefits to law-breakers on a silver platter. Clearly we have a large hurdle to overcome in compromising with this very atrocious bill.

However, with each day that we fail to pass meaningful border security reform, Americans become anxious that we will do nothing or even worse that we may cave in to the Senate. I heard from more than 14,000 constituents over the last month who emphatically told me that they do not want amnesty for law breakers.

Listen up America: We must stand united behind the border security bill passed by the House, H.R. 4437, and to proclaim to Americans that we agree with them and we will never give amnesty to illegal aliens.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.)

U.S. MILITARY'S READINESS PROBLEMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, on July 5, 1950, near the city of Osan in South Korea, North Korean forces faced a battalion of American soldiers who had been sent to stop the Korean advance. This battalion of 406 soldiers was undermanned, under-trained and poorly equipped. These soldiers fought a 7-hour battle that ended in retreat, and with 150 American infantrymen killed, wounded or missing.

This battalion was known as Task Force Smith, and its failure was due to a lack of readiness on the part of our military after World War II. Today, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that the low readiness levels of the Army and the Marine Corps are going to once again endanger our troops.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken about readiness problems before. And it continues to concern me as this situation worsens. Let me be blunt. Our ground forces and their reserves face a crisis with manpower and equipment shortages and will be challenged to complete their missions should they be called to respond to an emergency.

Mr. Speaker, I have used the word "readiness" many times before. But I feel it necessary to clearly define its meaning. Readiness describes the condition of our military forces. It is a measure of how well they are manned, trained and equipped to complete the full range of missions necessary to defend our Nation.

This is why the falling readiness levels of our Army and our Marine Corps are so disturbing. They indicate that we may not be able to defend our Nation's interests wherever they may face challenges. The most striking example of this problem is with equipment. Over 40 percent of the Army and Marine Corps ground equipment is now deployed to Iraq or Afghanistan. It is wearing out as much as nine times faster than normal. Only 3 years in Iraq has placed as much as 27 years of wear on our equipment, forcing the Department of Defense to cannibalize the equipment of non-deployed units and the National Guard.

This cannibalization of equipment has left the Army without a single combat brigade in the Continental United States ready for all of their war-time missions.

Simply put, the war in Iraq is sapping our strategic base and leaving us with a broken Army. The Armed Services Committee is nearing agreement to add \$20 billion to the Defense Authorization Act for next year to try to help fix this grave situation.

This will help, but the Department's readiness problems are too large to be fixed by a one-time investment. Together, the Army and Marine Corps need an astounding \$29 billion in 2007 to repair or replace equipment damaged in Iraq and Afghanistan. The amount is only part of the overall bill that represents a snapshot in time of a problem that is large and continues to grow.

The problem has developed over time due to mismanagement and a failure on the part of the administration to adequately plan for Iraq. It cannot be solved overnight. Congress can continue to provide band-aids for readiness shortfalls by funding through supplementals, but the Army and Marine Corps are limping along. They cannot keep pace with falling readiness levels.

The only way to truly solve this problem is for the administration to commit to fully funding the needs of the Department of Defense. This country is at war. Americans have a right to expect the administration to realistically budget for national defense. The stakes are high. Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford another Task Force Smith.

WAYZATA COMMUNITY CHURCH CELEBRATES 125 YEARS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Wayzata Community Church of Wayzata, MN, on its 125th anniversary of ministry and mission.

Founded in 1881 by a dozen early settlers on Lake Minnetonka, Wayzata Congregational Church grew to 70 members within 2 years. In 1912, a new church was built, but it burned down 4 years later. Remarkably, it was rebuilt by a determined congregation in only 7 months.

Then, in 1948, the church officially became Wayzata Community Church, and ground was broken for a new building at Ferndale Road and Wayzata Boulevard in Wayzata, where this dynamic community of faith is located today.

With nearly 3,000 members, Wayzata Community Church is one of the five largest congregations of the United Church of Christ. My family and I are grateful members of this loving and nurturing congregation. Our church is a place of spiritual growth, compassionate support and committed service.

For 125 years, Wayzata Community Church has been a place of growth and renewal, fellowship, outreach, community service, music ministries, and children and youth ministries.

For 125 years, Wayzata Community Church has been there to help people in need, people suffering the ravages of poverty, homelessness, hunger, addiction, broken homes, disease and despair.

One hundred twenty-five years of providing food, shelter, clothing, transportation, counseling and support groups.

Wayzata Community Church, Mr. Speaker, is a key partner of Interfaith Outreach and Community Partners, a partnership of faith communities, other community organizations and individuals that serve low-income people in eight of our west suburban communities.

Wayzata Community Church's extensive commitment to doing the Lord's work here on Earth also includes programs such as Adopt a Family, Families Moving Forward, Hurricane Relief, Loaves and Fishes, Meals on Wheels, Salvation Army bell ringers, the legendary Women's Fellowship annual rummage sale, and the Sleep Out for the Homeless, to name but a few.

Wayzata Community Church, Mr. Speaker, is truly a church that lives out the biblical command to love God, love others and serve the least amongst us.

The church is also a lively hub of activity in the Lake Minnetonka area for seniors, children and their friends and people of all ages. From music performances, authors, workshops, scouting, support groups, basketball games, nursery schools, you name it, it is all there at Wayzata Community Church.

Wayzata Community Church has also been blessed with truly visionary and dedicated leadership over the past 125 years.

On this historic anniversary, we are especially grateful for our current senior minister, Reverend Dr. John Ross,

and the entire pastoral staff, the Reverends Teresa Chamberlain, Kristen Jeide, Dr. James Newby and S. Linda Purdy.

We are also very thankful to all of the clergy who have served Wayzata Community Church during the past 125 years, as well as the other church staff, lay leaders, teachers, musicians, choir members, volunteers and other friends and members of Wayzata Community Church.

Mr. Speaker, on this special anniversary of Wayzata Community Church, let us pay tribute to 125 years of ministry and mission and pray that this wonderful community of faith will provide many more years of spiritual growth, support and service to the people of the Lake Minnetonka community.

□ 1600

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Georgia). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MCCARTHY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

RESTORING DEMOCRACY TO AMERICA

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of turn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, you can always tell when the Republicans fear an upcoming election because they start apologizing for their past transgressions.

So it should come as no surprise that the President finally acknowledged the presence and use of secret CIA prisons. The American people happen to think that the U.S. Constitution is a document that was never intended to be shredded and discarded like last week's newspaper, but that is exactly what is happening by the President and his rubber-stamp Republican Congress.

We do not have to subvert the freedoms and principles that make us Americans so that the President can fumble his way through finding and fighting terrorists like bin Laden.

We still believe in the rule of law, the first amendment, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights. We believe in the Geneva Convention, and the President undermines the American credibility, power and leadership around the world by dismissing a document so important that it is incorporated into the manuals of the U.S. Armed Forces.

America is not a democracy at your convenience, Mr. President. Without the protections provided by the first amendment, the American people might never have known about the abuses at Abu Ghraib; and without the

first amendment, the American people would have never known about the unauthorized wiretaps of the American people, even when there is a secret court specifically set up to enable America to defend itself without destroying the Constitution and the Bill of Rights in the process.

The American people still believe in the rule of law, and they can see that the President suspended the Constitution, the Geneva Convention, and the Bill of Rights because he finds them inconvenient.

The policies of this administration and the Republican Congress have not made America safer, but America is in danger on a whole new front, Presidential indifference to the principles and ideals that we are fighting for.

The President was given the tools and the resources after 9/11, but he pulled out before the job was done. He diverted our soldiers and resolve from Afghanistan to Iraq. It was a bad decision then, and it has become disastrous now in both places.

But with an automatic rubber-stamp Congress in the House and the Senate, the President could tell them what to think, tell them how to vote and get whatever he wanted. There was no balance in our government to ask the tough questions and hold the President accountable. There still is no balance in our government that can protect the American people and our founding policies from the brute force of the Republican power machine.

The President finally admitted he authorized secret CIA prisons, and in the next breath, demands the Congress authorize him to keep doing whatever he wants. And if the Republicans remain in power, they will do exactly what the President wants. No debate, no balance, nothing short of outright misrepresentation of the American people.

The Republicans misrepresent the American people when they rubber-stamp everything the President wants. That is not how America works, and it is not how democracy works. America is all about balance, debating different points of view, coming together as one Nation, standing on common ground. But that fundamental approach requires accountability, and there has been none under the Republicans.

For goodness sake, the Republicans could not even swear in Big Oil CEOs when they were called to Capitol Hill over skyrocketing prices. Republicans could not require these people to swear to tell the truth. Maybe they did; maybe they did not. We will never know.

And that is what the midterm election is really all about. America is tilted not merely to the right, but off the map entirely. Neocons who no one elected are telling the President and the Vice President what they are expected to do and what the Republican Congress will pass.

The American people may not understand the rules of Congress; but know this, Republicans delay every vote on

the floor of this House until they can twist enough arms to get what the neocons behind the curtain want. Debate is gone. Accountability is gone. And that is why the Republican control should be gone.

The Republicans have squandered their chance to govern. Republicans have shortchanged the American people for 12 long years. With free speech and free press, now the American people know it.

November is about restoring democracy to the Nation best able to protect it. November is about restoring balance to a Republican Congress that has forgotten that it works for the people, not for the neocons. No democracy can survive without a Congress that looks at the President's policies and asks questions and sometimes says no.

This President has had a free hand for far too long, and this election is a referendum on President Bush. If you want more, vote for a Republican. If you want to change it, vote for the Democrats.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THANK GOD FOR THIS DEMOCRACY AND THOSE PROTECTING IT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of turn for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized.

There was no objection.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, we hear people across the aisle talk about, gee, a rubber-stamp Congress. Well, I can point to you, that is the reason there is no immigration or border bill right now is because this is not a rubber-stamp Congress. The President wants some things that we simply cannot provide.

But when we talk about the allegations about Republicans or the President shredding the Constitution, let me tell you, he does not shred the Constitution. He has sworn to protect it, and I am proud that people who want to destroy the way of life that we have in this country, people that believe that freedom and democracy and self-government is a terrible thing, they think that that leads to debauchery and degradation, and therefore, you need some holy ayatollah that tells you everything you can or cannot do, that sends women back to being chattels as they never should have been but still are in some areas of the world, that is what they want to do to this country. They want to destroy people. They want to kill us, and we have a President that understands that.

Now, across the aisle we have some folks who want to be part of the blame America first crowd. They want you to know, gee, we are so bad, we are so terrible, look at Abu Ghraib. I asked my good friend SAM JOHNSON that serves here in the Congress what he thought about if he had been given a choice between the absolute horror that he went through in the North Vietnam prison compared to what happened at Abu Ghraib. It was a no-brainer.

What happened there was abuse. The people have gone to prison. They have been punished. What happened to American prisoners in North Vietnam, North Korea, what happened to American prisoners among those killers, those just blood-sucking, killing democracy, wanting to destroy people, terrorists, jihadists, cutting our people's heads off with dull instruments on camera, and that is who you want to embrace? There are even some people here in Washington that before Saddam went down, he flew over there. Never mind that Saddam was a murdering, blood-sucking thief who killed thousands and thousands. We go over and embrace Saddam and then come back and call our President the one in the wrong? My goodness, the blame America first crowd.

Those who want to blame Bush and Rumsfeld for the terrorist acts have missed the whole point. Since 1979 there has been a war going on. We just did not know it. We had a President then who allowed an act of war under international law, the attack of our embassy in Iran, to go unpunished, and for over a year, all we did was beg them to please release our hostages. It sent a bad message.

We were hit again in 1983 with the barracks. We were hit all through the 1990s with acts of war, including the first attack on our own continent at the World Trade Center in 1993. What did the Democratic administration and Democratic Congress do? Well, they wanted to prosecute them in civil court here in America instead of treating it as an act of war.

This President understands we are in war. Now we have a Supreme Court that has expressed concerns about Guantanamo. I went to Guantanamo, and having been a judge and chief justice, I have toured a lot of prisons. That was the nicest prison I have ever visited where the prisoners are being kept. But you know what we noticed? We were told do not let the prisoners hear you because they will think you are with the Red Cross or somebody. One of the people with us, and they heard somebody there and they started all of sudden going from laughing and being giddy and funny between themselves to, oh, please help me, I am being tortured and all this baloney. Well, they are playing to the crowds. That was obvious.

I would submit if the Supreme Court is all that concerned, we need to put that hurricane fence back around the Supreme Court building that was there

during construction recently and move those people from Abu Ghraib so they can watch them directly and they can look out their windows, maybe let them use their restroom facilities so they can supervise more closely what this administration is trying to protect us from.

You cannot blame President Bush and Rumsfeld for the current terrorist attacks unless you are squarely willing to put the blame for 9/11 on the Clinton administration because that is when it was planned, that was when it was prepared and almost completed, and then it carried over and was finished during this administration. This President saw it for what it was, an act of war that had to be addressed.

The price for liberty, as our forefathers said, is eternal vigilance. We cannot keep blaming America first, as our friends across the aisle want to do. We have to recognize, as this President and this Secretary of Defense has, we are in a war against us, and we finally have an administration that recognizes that and is out to protect us and protect the Constitution. Thank God for this democracy and those protecting it.

□ 1615

IRAQ POLICY

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had the honor to visit a group of folks gathered on the Mall as part of Camp Democracy, a nonpartisan camp for peace, for democracy and for the restoration of rule of law.

Those who gathered are relentlessly working to promote peace and justice. They bring great passion to our shared struggle. They have led one of the most important and powerful grassroots movements in recent memory, and because of the pressure they have applied and the eloquence with which they have made the case, the immorality of the Bush Iraq policy has been exposed.

Mr. Speaker, in a few months, our troops will have been in Iraq for as long as their grandfathers fought in World War II. But unlike the struggle against Nazism, this has been an unmitigated disaster, a national tragedy and a moral outrage. More than 2,650 soldiers of our own are dead, nearly 20,000 wounded by the Pentagon's own count and countless more psychologically traumatized. And for what? So we could make the world a more dangerous place and increase the terrorist threat? So we could create more jihadists and inspire more hatred for Americans among Muslim extremists? So we could foment a bloody civil war and rip a nation apart at its seams, killing tens of thousands of innocent civilians for the cause of their so-called liberation?

Like the people at Camp Democracy, I have been speaking out against this war and this occupation even before they began. I have held forums, forced votes on resolutions and joined demonstrators at rallies across the country. Most recently, I introduced a bill that would rescind the President's authority to use force in Iraq, authority that was granted in 2002 under what we now know are false pretenses. I will not give up this fight until every last American soldier has been returned home to his or her family.

But even after that, we will have plenty of work to do, because Iraq is only a part of the problem. The real problem is a foreign policy that uses too much brawn and not enough brains. The real problem is an approach to national security that says might is always right; that says, when it doubt, shoot first and ask questions later. What we need is to completely overhaul the way we handle global conflict and prevent wars from starting in the very first place.

Working with the Friends Committee, working with WAND and working with Physicians for Social Responsibility, I created the SMART Security plan, which was introduced in the House in 2005. SMART would do just what I was talking about. SMART stands for Sensible Multilateral American Response to Terrorism. It emphasizes peacekeeping and diplomacy instead of invasion and occupancy. It rejects war in all but the most extreme circumstances. It fights terrorism with stronger global partnerships and with sound diplomacy, with better intelligence, with tough weapons inspections but without violating our civil liberties and fundamental freedoms.

SMART would put more resources into securing loose nuclear material and ensuring the United States lives up to the commitments we have made in our Nation on nuclear nonproliferation. SMART would wean us off Middle Eastern oil. It would invest in renewable energy technologies instead of Cold War weapon systems that have outlived their usefulness. SMART would dramatically increase development aid and debt relief for the poorest countries in the world to combat the deprivation and despair that often gives rise to terrorism in the first place. It protects not by wreaking violent havoc around the world but by staying faithful to the most honorable American values.

Armed conflict around the world is destroying our bodies and our souls. I am particularly troubled by the devastating impact this war is having on our children. Our children are the war's most tragic victims. Children represent a disproportionate number of civilian deaths in conflicts worldwide. And for many who survive, their education is disrupted, their communities destroyed and their families separated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. POE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. EMANUEL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

STATUS REPORT ON CURRENT SPENDING LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FY 2007 AND THE 5-YEAR PERIOD FY 2007 THROUGH FY 2011

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I am transmitting a status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 2007 and for the 5-year period of fiscal years 2007 through 2011. This report is necessary to facilitate the application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act and sections 401 and 501 of H. Con. Res. 376, which is currently in effect as a concurrent resolution on the budget in the House under H. Res. 818. This status report is current through September 1, 2006.

The term "current level" refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President's signature.

The first table in the report compares the current levels of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues with the aggregate levels set by H. Con. Res. 376. This comparison is needed to enforce section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution's aggregate levels. The table does not show budget authority and outlays for years after fiscal year 2007 because appropriations for those years have not yet been considered.

The second table compares the current levels of budget authority and outlays for discretionary action by each authorizing committee with the "section 302(a)" allocations made under H. Con. Res. 376 for fiscal year 2007 and fiscal years 2007 through 2011. "Discretionary action" refers to legislation enacted after the adoption of the budget resolution. This comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the section 302(a) discretionary action allocation of new budget authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(b), which exempts

committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

The third table compares the current levels of discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 2007 with the "section 302(b)" suballocations of discretionary budget authority and outlays among Appropriations subcommittees. The comparison is also needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act because the point of order under that section equally applies to measures that would breach the applicable section 302(b) suballocation.

The fourth table gives the current level for 2008 of accounts identified for advance appropriations under section 401 of H. Con. Res. 376. This list is needed to enforce section 401 of the budget resolution, which creates a point of order against appropriation bills that contain advance appropriations that are: (i) not identified in the statement of managers or (ii) would cause the aggregate amount of such appropriations to exceed the level specified in the resolution.

The fifth table provides the current level of the nondefense reserve fund for emergencies established by section 501 of H. Con. Res. 376. The table is required by section 505 of the budget resolution, and is needed to determine whether an increase in the reserve fund, allocations and aggregates will be necessary for any pending legislation that contains emergency-designated discretionary budget authority.

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET—STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2007 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN HOUSE CONFERENCE RESOLUTION 376

(Reflecting Action Completed as of September 1, 2006—On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal years—	
	2007	2007–2011
Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority	2,283,029	(1)
Outlays	2,325,998	(1)
Revenues	1,780,666	10,039,909
Current Level:		
Budget Authority	1,376,976	(1)
Outlays	1,712,503	(1)
Revenues	1,787,468	10,182,129
Current Level over (+) / under (–) Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority	–906,053	(1)
Outlays	–613,495	(1)
Revenues	6,802	142,220

¹ Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for fiscal years 2008 through 2011 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

BUDGET AUTHORITY

Enactment of measures providing new budget authority for FY 2007 in excess of \$906,053,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2007 budget authority to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 376.

OUTLAYS

Enactment of measures providing new outlays for FY 2007 in excess of \$613,495,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2007 outlays to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 376.

REVENUES

Enactment of measures that would reduce revenue for FY 2007 in excess of \$6,802,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 376.

Enactment of measures resulting in revenue reduction for the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2011 in excess of \$142,220,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate levels set by H. Con. Res. 376.

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR DISCRETIONARY ACTION, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF SEPTEMBER 1, 2006

(Fiscal years, in millions of dollars)

House Committee	2007		2007–2011 Total	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Agriculture:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Armed Services:				
Allocation	45	45	45	45
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	–45	–45	–45	–45
Education and the Workforce:				
Allocation	0	1	0	30
Current Level	16	119	178	–1,733
Difference	16	118	178	–1,763
Energy and Commerce:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Financial Services:				
Allocation	0	0	2	2
Current Level	0	0	–3	–3
Difference	0	0	–5	–5
Government Reform:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
House Administration:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Homeland Security:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
International Relations:				
Allocation	1	1	5	5
Current Level	0	–5	0	–12
Difference	–1	–6	–5	–17
Judiciary:				
Allocation	19	16	116	113
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	–19	–16	–116	–113
Resources:				
Allocation	0	0	6	6
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	–6	–6
Science:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Small Business:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Transportation and Infrastructure:				
Allocation	13	13	22	22
Current Level	0	–3	–4	–19
Difference	–13	–16	–26	–41
Veterans' Affairs:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	–3	–3	0	0
Difference	–3	–3	0	0
Ways and Means:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	1	–4	–3
Difference	0	1	–4	–3

DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATION AND APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE 302(b) SUBALLOCATIONS

(In millions of dollars)

Appropriations Subcommittee	302(b) suballocations as of June 6, 2006 (H. Rpt. 109–488)		Current level reflecting action completed as of September 1, 2006		Current level minus suballocations	
	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA	17,812	19,497	7	5,827	–17,805	–13,670

DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATION AND APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE 302(b) SUBALLOCATIONS—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

Appropriations Subcommittee	302(b) suballocations as of June 6, 2006 (H. Rpt. 109-488)		Current level reflecting action completed as of September 1, 2006		Current level minus suballocations	
	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Defense	377,357	393,165	42	142,855	-377,315	-250,310
Energy & Water Development	30,017	31,411	0	12,624	-30,017	-18,787
Foreign Operations	21,300	23,441	0	14,607	-21,300	-8,834
Homeland Security	32,080	38,711	0	19,234	-32,080	-19,477
Interior-Environment	25,889	26,902	0	10,660	-25,889	-16,242
Labor, HHS & Education	141,930	145,631	19,168	100,082	-122,762	-45,549
Legislative Branch	4,030	4,013	0	622	-4,030	-3,391
Military Quality of Life-Veterans Affairs	94,705	88,728	-2,329	18,768	-97,034	-69,960
Science-State-Justice-Commerce	59,839	62,143	0	23,536	-59,839	-38,607
Transportation-Treasury-HUD-Judiciary-DC	67,819	130,069	4,273	75,894	-63,546	-54,175
Unassigned	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total (Section 302(a) Allocation)	872,778	963,711	21,161	424,709	-851,617	-539,002

Statement of FY2008 advance appropriations under section 401 of House Concurrent Resolution 376, reflecting action completed as of September 1, 2006

Appropriate Level	Budget Authority	23,565
Current Level:		
Elk Hills	0	
Corporation for Public Broadcasting	0	
Employment and Training Administration	0	
Education for the Disadvantaged	0	
School Improvement	0	
Children and Family Services (Head Start)	0	
Special Education	0	
Vocational and Adult Education	0	
Transportation (highway, transit, Farley Building)	0	
Payment to Postal Service	0	
Section 8 Renewals	0	
Total	0	
Current Level over (+) / under (-) Appropriate Level		-23,565

Statement of nondefense reserve fund for emergencies under section 501 of House Concurrent Resolution 376, discretionary budget authority for FY2007 reflecting action completed as of September 1, 2006

	[In millions of dollars]	
Appropriate Level	Budget Authority	6,450
Current Level		0
Current Level over (+) / under (-) Appropriate Level		-6,450

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, September 7, 2006.

Hon. JIM NUSSLE,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2007 budget and is current through September 1, 2006. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of H. Con. Res. 376, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2007, as approved by the House of Representatives. Although the House and the Senate have not reached agreement on a concurrent budget resolution for 2007, H. Con. Res. 376 has the force and effect in the House for all purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as though adopted by the Congress pursuant to House Resolution 818.

Pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for

Fiscal Year 2006, provisions designated as emergency requirements are exempt from enforcement of the budget resolution. As a result, the enclosed current level report excludes the exempt amounts that affect 2007 spending (see footnote 2 of the report).

Since my last letter, dated June 28, the Congress has cleared and the President has signed the following acts that affect budget authority, outlays, or revenues for fiscal year 2007:

The Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-241);

The Returned Americans Protection Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-250);

An act approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom Democracy Act of 2003 (Public Law 109-251);

An act to provide funding authority to facilitate the evacuation of persons from Lebanon (Public Law 109-268); and

The Pension Protection Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-280).

In addition, corrections have been made to the final scoring for both the Native American Technical Corrections Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-221) and the Mine Improvement and New Emergency Response Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-236). These corrections resulted in an \$11 million increase and a \$4 million increase in revenues, respectively.

Sincerely,

DONALD B. MARRON,
Acting Director.

Enclosure.

FISCAL YEAR 2007 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT AS OF SEPTEMBER 1, 2006

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Enacted in previous sessions: ¹			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	1,819,599
Permanents and other spending legislation ...	1,355,241	1,303,587	n.a.
Appropriation legislation	0	409,185	n.a.
Offsetting receipts	-549,710	-549,710	n.a.
Total, enacted in previous sessions:	805,531	1,163,062	1,819,599
Enacted this session:			
An act to make available funds included in the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program for fiscal year 2006 (P.L. 109-204)	-1,000	-520	0
Native American Technical Corrections Act of 2006 (P.L. 109-221)	11	11	11
Tax Increase Prevention and Reconciliation Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-222)	0	0	-32,674
Heroes Earned Retirement Opportunities Act (P.L. 109-227)	0	0	-4
Veterans' Housing Opportunity and Benefits Improvement Act of 2006 (P.L. 109-233) ..	-3	-3	0

FISCAL YEAR 2007 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT AS OF SEPTEMBER 1, 2006—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Hurricane Recovery, 2006 (P.L. 109-234) ²	0	388	168
Broadcast Decency Enforcement Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-235)	0	0	1
Mine Improvement and New Emergency Response Act of 2006 (P.L. 109-236)	1	0	5
Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2006 (P.L. 109-241)	0	-3	0
Returned Americans Protection Act of 2006 (P.L. 109-250)	0	1	0
An act approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom Democracy Act of 2003 (P.L. 109-251)	0	0	-1
An act to provide funding authority to facilitate the evacuation of persons from Lebanon (P.L. 109-268)	0	-5	0
Pension Protection Act of 2006 (P.L. 109-280) ..	15	119	363
Total, enacted this session:	-976	-12	-32,131
Entitlements and mandatory:			
Budget resolution estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs not yet enacted	572,421	549,453	n.a.
Total Current Level ^{2,3}	1,376,976	1,712,503	1,787,468
Total Budget Resolution	2,283,029	2,325,998	1,780,666
Current Level Over Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	6,802
Current Level Under Budget Resolution	906,053	613,495	n.a.
Memorandum:			
Revenues, 2007-2011:			
House Current Level	n.a.	n.a.	10,182,129
House Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	10,039,909
Current Level Over Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	142,220
Current Level Under Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

1. The effects of the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-171) and the Federal Deposit Insurance Reform Conforming Amendments Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-173) are included in this section of the table, consistent with the budget resolution assumptions. In addition, the scoring for the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 includes savings from corrections to two provisions (in sections 8006 and 10002) not yet enacted, consistent with the budget resolution assumptions.

2. Pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2006, provisions designated as emergency requirements are exempt from enforcement of the budget resolution. As a result, the current-level totals exclude \$48 million in budget authority for 2007 and \$39,461 million in outlays for 2007 from the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Hurricane Recovery, 2006 (P.L. 109-234).

3. Excludes administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration, which are off-budget.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

Notes: n.a.=not applicable; P.L.=Public Law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SCHIFF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

IRAQ WATCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening as we come to the floor again as part of what we have come to call our Iraq Watch, and I am grateful that we are joined by several colleagues this evening, Mr. BISHOP from New York, Mr. McDERMOTT from Washington State, and others that will be joining us throughout this early part of the evening.

Now, let me start, as we always have, by recognizing the valiant service of the men and women who wear the uniform. And as our leader Ms. PELOSI often says, our men and women who wear the uniform deserve a leadership that is worthy of the sacrifice that they make on a daily basis. I am proud of this Congress, inasmuch as it has been able to distinguish the warriors from the war, and so we continue to honor those brave men and women who wear the uniform of this country and who sacrifice daily on our behalf.

And yet, as events unfold around the globe, but specifically in the Middle East as it relates to Iraq, what we find is even amongst those who initially favored the war, such as pundits like Thomas Friedman, who now have come to say that we have got to come to the realization that we are no longer midwifing democracy in Iraq but, in essence, babysitting an insurgent civil war. So this evening we come here to discuss Iraq from the context of the mistakes that have been made and the need for accountability, starting with the resignation of the Secretary of Defense.

At some point, somewhere along the line, there has got to be accountability for the actions that have transpired in Iraq. We were wrong about the information that led up to going into the war. In fact, the strongest critics against us going into the war were people such as Scowcroft, Eagleburger, Kissinger and Baker, hardly left-leaning liberals, but people who understood international policy and the severe consequences that would result if we

ended up going into Iraq without the full support of the world. And so Americans everywhere kind of have to scratch their heads and say, how is it that we had the entire world with us when we invaded Afghanistan and end up virtually with no support in Iraq.

It is clear from discussions with policymakers and former generals that a series of mistakes have been made, not the least of which was going against our own national policy, the Weinberger Doctrine, which stated very clearly the United States should never go to war against another country unless its vital interests are threatened; and the Powell corollary to that, if we do go in, we should go in with overwhelming force.

In both cases, that doctrine and corollary were rejected in favor of the doctrine of preemption and unilateralism, which has left our allies looking at us as we twist slowly in the winds of Iraq, as Friedman says, babysitting an insurrection and civil war while our most precious of resources, our men and women who serve this country, are in harm's way.

We need a new direction. We ought to send a very clear signal to the world, to the people in this country that it is time for accountability; that it is time to say that mistakes were made and then move on. And we can start with Defense Secretary Rumsfeld stepping down, as he should.

The head of the 9/11 Commission has indicated to both Republicans and Democrats alike that we need to continue to adopt those resolutions and recommendations that they have found in their studies, 20 of which still aren't implemented, which is over half. And so in order to prosecute the war on terror, we have got to be able to accomplish those goals. But without a Congress that wants to hold the President accountable, that is not going to happen.

A gentleman that has been doing just that and speaking out in his district has been TIM BISHOP of New York, and at this time, I would like to yield to him.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. I thank my friend from Connecticut for yielding, and I also thank him for his ongoing leadership on this and so many other issues of importance here in our Congress.

Let me just pick up on a few comments that were made with respect to oversight and accountability. And I find it particularly ironic, when one studies the tragic history of our involvement in Iraq, and whether it begins with the misuse of prewar intelligence or whether it begins in effect with the reasons that we were given for going to war, none of which turned out to be accurate, all of which turned out really to be more about marketing a war than about a real threat that imperiled our safety and security, that we are now being told by these very same people that have led us so far astray, that have so weakened our Nation and

so exposed us to a war on terror that we must fight much more vigilantly than we have thus far; we are now being told that these are the people that we must continue to keep in leadership positions in order to keep us free and safe. And, in fact, it is their very leadership, and I am speaking specifically about the Secretary of Defense and other civilian leaders in the Pentagon, that have led us so far astray.

When you chronicle the mistakes that were made in Iraq, we best-cased the result of our involvement in Iraq and we worst-cased the threat that was there. We invaded with too few troops. We have certainly sufficient troops to overthrow a regime that spent a fraction on defense relative to what we spend on defense, but we invaded with too few troops to secure the peace. We failed to secure the borders. We failed to secure ammo dumps. We failed to see to it that our troops were properly equipped and outfitted, and that was because the leadership of the Pentagon refused to accept the warnings that had been given by so many different experts in this area, that we weren't going to be welcomed with open arms, that we weren't going to be treated as conquering heroes and liberators, but in fact we were going to be viewed as occupiers and invaders.

But our troops arrived with insufficient body armor, with insufficiently armored vehicles because this insurgency was not recognized or anticipated. And yet we have these very same people telling us that they are the ones that are going to keep us safe.

□ 1630

I will just say one other thing, and then yield back. I think this is an administration that specializes in giving us false choices. We are now being presented with the latest false choice, and that is that those of us who do not support the "stay the course" in Iraq can be accused of wanting to abandon the war on terror.

Nothing could be further from the truth. There is not a soul on our side of the aisle that would advocate abandoning the war on terror. Everyone on our side of the aisle would advocate continuing to wage that war, but to wage it with the full resources of this Nation and to wage it much more intelligently than we have thus far.

The sad truth about our involvement in Iraq is that it has stripped us of the resources that we need to wage the war on terror. It is why Osama bin Laden remains at large 5 years after September 11, and it is why al Qaeda remains as powerful as it is.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. If the gentleman will let me ask a question, knowing you are from New York and knowing specifically you are from Long Island, and, of course, with a solemn date approaching us of September 11, do most citizens in New York understand, in your estimation, the difference between the war on global terrorism and the war in Iraq and see

them as different subject matters, or, as IKE SKELTON on the Armed Services Committee has been so nobly trying to demonstrate, the difference between the insurrection and civil war in Iraq and the war on terror? Or has the administration's attempts to blur the lines confused people? What is the sense of New Yorkers?

Mr. BISHOP of New York. My sense is that New Yorkers have not been fooled. My sense is that New Yorkers, and there is hardly a New Yorker who did not lose a loved one or did not lose a friend in the Twin Towers, most New Yorkers recognize that we are fighting two separate and distinct wars, despite, as you say, the administration's efforts to blur the distinction and to cojoin them in an effort to justify something that the vast majority of Americans now recognize was a tragic mistake.

When I go around my district, one of the questions I ask people is do they feel safer today, in August of 2006, than they did on September 12, 2001, and the answer overwhelmingly is no. The answer overwhelmingly is no.

I think most people recognize in my district, and I am grateful for this, that the war in Iraq, which was purportedly to make us safe, make us more safe, has in fact imperiled us beyond where we were the day we invaded.

I think that that is an important recognition and an important distinction for those of us who recognize the distinction needs to continue to be made.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. We have been joined by the gentleman from Massachusetts. I think for a number of our listeners, really the whole idea for coming to this floor came from BILL DELAHUNT. The idea really wasn't hatched here on the floor of the House of Representatives. It was an idea that was hatched in town hall meetings in Nantucket and on the Cape that BILL DELAHUNT held. He encouraged other Members, including myself, who had them in West Hartford and Manchester, Connecticut, and from there, because our voices were muffled. Or if you spoke out against the war, you were deemed unpatriotic. But it was because of his efforts in organizing an Iraq Watch that this has persisted and the truth has been able to continue to come out with regard to our involvement.

At this time I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the founder of this great movement.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I think, tragically, and I mean this sincerely, tragically those of us who spoke out early against the invasion in Iraq, because we believed that there was not significant evidence which established that Iraq was a clear and present danger to the United States and our allies, we have been proven to be correct.

TIM BISHOP, our colleague from New York, used the term "abandoned." Accusations have been made that some who have criticized the competence

and the rationale of this administration regarding Iraq have "abandoned" the war on terror. That is patently false. That is untrue. There is no relationship between the war against terrorism and the war in Iraq.

Now, let me put forth a hypothesis: this administration abandoned the war against terror in a very real way when we were distracted by the neoconservative vision of invading Iraq, because the consequence of the invasion of Iraq was in a large degree the diversion of those assets and initiatives that were necessary to secure Afghanistan, where al Qaeda had been harbored, where al Qaeda thrived, and where there was an opportunity to apprehend Osama bin Laden.

But, no, we were more interested in Saddam Hussein, who was an arch-enemy of Osama bin Laden. Osama bin Laden considered Saddam Hussein an apostate, an infidel, an enemy of his version, his perverted version, of Islam. In fact, in 1994, it was Osama bin Laden who approached the Saudi royal family and suggested they combine forces and depose Saddam Hussein because he was an apostate; he was a defiler of Islam.

So what do we have today? We have a situation in Afghanistan where the headlines now read: "A Resurgence of the Taliban." That government that harbored and gave support to Osama bin Laden and al Qaeda, they are coming back. Another headline in the past 2 days, the British general who heads the NATO deployment in Afghanistan made this plea: "I need more troops or we will lose Afghanistan."

So who abandoned the war on terror? Who abandoned the war on terror? Do not confuse the war in Iraq and the war on terror. We all have an obligation to educate ourselves about the differences, the nuances, the realities on the ground. This is too important. This is about our future, and this is about the future of American generations far into the next decades.

I know my colleague from Maryland who has joined us, CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, has a specific interest in Afghanistan. What is happening today in Afghanistan is a disgraceful example of the incompetence and the legacy of this administration's policy by going into Iraq.

And what have we achieved? We have achieved a resurgence of the Taliban and other terrorist elements in Afghanistan. By the way, what else we have achieved is we have created a new superpower in the region, Iran. Because while we are standing here discussing among ourselves this region in the world, let it be very clear to the American people that there is an emerging warm relationship between Iran and the new government in Iraq. Do your homework, and you will discover that there is a bilateral military cooperation agreement that exists today between Iraq and Iran.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. I would like to ask the gentleman a question: What you are telling me and you are

telling our viewing audience this evening, you voted, and I believe the vote was near unanimous in the House of Representatives and the Senate, to invade Afghanistan in Operation Enduring Freedom; is that correct?

Mr. DELAHUNT. I voted, and, again, with one exception out of 435 Members, there was a unanimous vote here in this Chamber, bipartisan, Republicans and Democrats and Independent, to go to Afghanistan and destroy al Qaeda and find Osama bin Laden and apprehend him.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Was not the rest of the world united in that effort with the United States?

Mr. DELAHUNT. I have this vivid memory of the day after 9/11, a headline that appeared in the paper of record in France that said: "We Are All Americans Today." We had support in every corner of the world for what we were doing. We would have succeeded in the war on terror by now. But, no. But, no. We invaded Iraq, and clearly that has created implications for our national security.

If I may just for one moment, and I am not alone when I say this, it is interesting, today in the Wall Street Journal a former Republican Speaker of the House of Representatives, Newt Gingrich of Georgia, who succeeded in securing a majority for the Republican Party in this House in 1994, was quoted. Remember, this is a Republican, a leader. The speculation is that he is considering running for the Presidency in 2008.

This is what Newt Gingrich had to say. Just consider the following: "Osama bin Laden is still at large." I agree. "Afghanistan is still insecure." I would suggest that it is unraveling. "Iraq is still violent." 3,000 deaths a month. "North Korea and Iran are still building nuclear weapons and missiles. Terrorist recruiting is still occurring in the United States, Canada, Great Britain and across the planet."

Those are Newt Gingrich's words, today, in the Wall Street Journal.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. So how is it then, given all that you have said, that with the world behind us in support of Operation Enduring Freedom, that we would, if you will excuse the phrase, why did we "cut and run" in Afghanistan and then focus on Iraq?

As the gentleman from New York pointed out, people are able to distinguish between the enemy who actually knocked down the Twin Towers in New York, struck the Pentagon, and, as Tim Roemer pointed out yesterday, were it not for those brave souls on Flight 93, would have hit this Capitol. How did we go from the whole world being behind us, abandoning what has become, as Mr. VAN HOLLEN often points out, the forgotten front in Afghanistan, take our eye off the prize and expend the amount of money, and, most importantly, our most precious resource, our men and women who serve this country in Iraq?

□ 1645

Mr. DELAHUNT. Well, if one reviews the memoir of Paul O'Neill, former Republican Secretary of the Treasury, who served in this Bush administration for 2 years, and in that capacity was a member of the National Security Council, you will discover that he was as surprised as anyone when 10 days after this President was inaugurated at a National Security Council meeting, there was a discussion about Iraq and the need to remove Saddam Hussein who, about 6 weeks later on February 22 of 2001, months before 9/11, there was a meeting when Secretary Rumsfeld had a map of the oil fields in Iraq spread out on a table.

The discussion, it was prepared by the Defense Intelligence Agency, and there was a discussion about how those oil fields would be divvied up between nations and various big oil companies.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Thank you, Mr. DELAHUNT, and thank you, Mr. LARSON, and others who are gathered here to talk about these very important national security questions. As you pointed out, Mr. DELAHUNT and Mr. LARSON, we have taken our eye off the ball here. As we approach the terrible fifth anniversary of the tragic attacks of 2001, September 11, it is important to remember that the attacks upon our homeland were launched by al Qaeda from Afghanistan and had nothing to do with Iraq, nothing to do with Iraq.

Yet here, as we gather 5 years later, we have not finished the job in Afghanistan. We have not finished the job against al Qaeda. Indeed, the situation is now getting worse today than it was a year ago and even a year before that.

Now, the President has said in the last 10 days that he wants to have a national conversation about Iraq and national security, and he has delivered a number of speeches. But when you listen to what he has had to say, it is clear that unfortunately once again he is not interested in the national conversation. Conversation implies a give and take, a dialogue, an exchange of views.

But when you listen to the President, on the one hand he lays out his idea of what he wants to go forward and then engages in finger-pointing and name calling of anybody who disagrees with him. Secretary Rumsfeld and Vice President CHENEY have gone around this country engaging in name calling and finger-pointing against anyone who disagrees with them.

They got all the answers, they tell us. You know what? For years and years they have gotten away with that by the majority in this Congress. The Republican majority in this Congress has essentially said, yes, you two have all the answers, and we are going to write you a blank check, and we are not going to ask you the hard questions.

Well, I am glad the President wants to have a big national conversation. Let's make this a real conversation on national security. I say, let's have it,

because I think when the American people look at the facts on the ground, and the fact that this administration has made our world and our country a much more dangerous place than it otherwise had to be, that people will ask questions about whose judgment is best in these matters.

Let us just think back to May 2003 aboard the aircraft carrier USS *Lincoln*. The President gave a speech with a big banner behind him, "mission accomplished," mission accomplished. That was May 2003, more than 3 years ago. We haven't finished the mission in Afghanistan, and we have got a mess on our hands in Iraq.

Let us just think back to more than a year ago. Vice President CHENEY said that the insurgency in Iraq was in its, quote, final throes, the last gasp.

Well, we just had a Pentagon report come out a few days ago. Here is what they had to say about that. In addition to a budding civil war or a civil war, they say the Sunni-based insurgency remains, quote, potent and viable.

For years now Secretary Rumsfeld has been giving us these sorts of rosy scenarios about what would happen in Iraq, and he has been proven wrong again and again and again.

So when the President and his people say to the American people, we have got all the answers, I think the American people get it now that they don't have all the answers. We need to have this debate and this discussion.

Let me just quickly go back to the issue of Afghanistan, because the world was with us. We were united as a Nation, we were united as a NATO alliance, and we were united as an international community. The United Nations unanimously passed a resolution saying they were with the United States in its war on terror and its war on al Qaeda.

Yet, today, al Qaeda is still active, they are still plotting, they are still trying to do harm to Americans and others around the world. Yet, if you look at what is happening in Afghanistan right now, we have got to be concerned. The United States is not doing all that it should in Afghanistan. The major resurgence has occurred in the southern part of Afghanistan. That has been the stronghold for the Taliban. Yet we have reduced, reduced, the number of U.S. forces in southern Afghanistan.

Second, we, the Bush administration, disbanded the only unit within the CIA whose specific mission was to go after al Qaeda. They said, we don't need it anymore. That's what they said about a month ago. That was before the President again quoted Osama bin Laden a few days ago in one of his speeches for why we still need to be concerned. Well, we should be concerned. That is why what we are doing in Afghanistan has not made sense.

Third, we just learned the other day that the opium production in Afghanistan is at an all-time record, all-time record. We know that the funds from

those sales of those drugs are being used to fuel al Qaeda and the Taliban.

Finally, finally, we just learned yesterday of this agreement now between the Government of Pakistan, General Musharraf, has entered into this agreement with the pro-Taliban militia, and the agreement says we, the Pakistan military, will now take a hands-off posture along the northwest frontier, that was the Waziristan part of Pakistan where the Taliban have regrouped and where al Qaeda has regrouped and what they have used to launch attacks into Afghanistan.

Now Musharraf is saying, no, that is not what he meant. But it is very clear he has essentially said Pakistan military isn't coming after you anymore, you Taliban who are in that part of Pakistan. We have a hands-off policy. That is simply a signal to them that they can now more freely operate to try to step up their attacks in Afghanistan, that they can continue to collaborate with al Qaeda.

So here we are, here we are coming up on the fifth anniversary of those tragic attacks launched from Afghanistan by al Qaeda because they were given safe haven by the Taliban, and we haven't finished the job, and we have reduced the amount of resources that we are committing to completing the mission. Mission accomplished, nowhere near it.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President and Vice President.

The gentleman from Connecticut may resume.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The President has asked to engage, and the gentleman made several good points and one of them was about a new dialogue, long overdue, and I think welcomed by the American people. But as the gentleman from Maryland points out, a one-way street.

Certainly no one knows better than the gentleman from Washington State. No one was vilified more, both on this floor and in public, because of love of country and speaking out, than JIM McDERMOTT.

I recognize the gentleman from Washington State.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Thank you very much. As I sit here and I listen to this today, I think about the Katrina event. You saw the President go down and throw his arm around the guy who was fixing Katrina. He said, Good job, Brownie. I mean, that has become a laughingstock.

Well, this President has done the same thing with Rumsfeld. Beginning in 2004, when Abu Ghraib came out, the President showed up and said the Secretary is doing a great job, right? This will not change as long as the President keeps Rumsfeld in that job, because Rumsfeld is the controlling power behind it all.

As long as the President puts him out there and let's him run, you are going

to continue to have this stuff. Rumsfeld went to Iraq in July while we were on vacation, right at the end, and they found the bodies of 20 kidnapped and murdered bus drivers the day he arrived. A bomber blew himself up and killed seven people. The Secretary of Defense made what I consider to be an interesting statement in response to that. He said, each time I come to Iraq, I see progress.

Now, no one who has any kind of realistic view of this could say that kind of thing. You could not be watching what is going on, when it is to our troops who are dying, or the wounded who are coming home, or the thousands of Iraqis who are being killed and say, I see progress. There is simply, you have got your military people talking about the fact that it is coming apart, you had Rumsfeld this week say to some National Guardsmen from California, no, you can't go home, I know your enlistment is up, but you have got to stay here for another 120 days.

We are going to send you into Baghdad to calm things down. It is a mess, and it has been a mess from the start because Rumsfeld would never listen. Like the President, he wouldn't listen. General Shinseki came in and said, you are going to need 300,000 troops. Rumsfeld said, you don't know what you are saying, you are out of here. Here is your retirement. Get out of here.

That is the response to anybody who comes into this administration and talks. Unless the President will dump Rumsfeld, you are not going to get any change in the policy. What is the alternative to the people of this country? The only alternative they have is on election day to take the gavel away from the Republican majority so that we can have hearings run by Democrats where some questions will be asked, where there will be some accountability so that things will begin to come up into the public view.

We have never found out what Halliburton's contracts are all about. We haven't found out who is responsible for Abu Ghraib. No, there isn't a soldier or a sailor or a marine or anyone near the military.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Is the gentleman suggesting that the more than \$9 billion that is unaccounted for, that this Congress actually ought to go and find out what happened with those no-bid contracts, \$9 billion?

Mr. McDERMOTT. Only if you care about taxpayer money. I mean, the examples are so bald and so bad that it is almost laughable if it wasn't what was going on today and it was taking us down the wrong trail.

What has been said here today is, I was reading the Middle Eastern papers today, everybody says that half of Afghanistan is now under control of the Taliban. That is universal in the press.

The British general there is saying we are losing this thing; he is worried. We will not get a change unless we get some hard questions asked. We are

never going to get them from the Republicans because they are going to rubber-stamp what Mr. Bush and Mr. Rumsfeld and all the rest of that bunch put together. I personally think this election is the most important election we have had in my lifetime.

□ 1700

You say to yourself maybe I am getting old or something, but I went through Vietnam, and I went through a whole bunch of things. But this one, if we have 2 more years of "stay the course," God knows where we are going to be economically and militarily and politically and diplomatically in the world. We have got to get some change, and Rumsfeld would be a start. There are some other people that should go, but if the President can't see that Rumsfeld cannot handle it; he threw out Paul O'Neill as the Secretary of the Treasury, and he threw out some other people, Colin Powell and some others went down the road, but he keeps the guy who got us in the mess because it means he would have to admit that he made a huge mistake, and he can't do it. He can't do it, and that is the biggest problem he has.

As politicians, sometimes you have to say, "I was wrong. I made a mistake."

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. The gentleman from Maine who has been to the floor several times to talk about this very subject recently traveled to New Orleans also where he traveled with the Army Corps of Engineers where he saw firsthand what was going on there. As the gentleman from Washington states, one of the many salient points he made is the lack of accountability and the corollary between what has happened here domestically with Hurricane Katrina and Iraq.

I yield to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. I thank you all for the opportunity to be here and discuss some of these important issues that we don't get to do during any debate on resolutions or legislation. These are among the most important issues we deal with.

I was down in New Orleans and in the gulf coast of Mississippi where the incompetence of this administration was on display for everyone to see. The same incompetence is on display with respect to the problems we have created in Iraq. And I say "created" because I do believe that in many ways this administration has created more problems in the Middle East than they have solved.

I agree with the gentleman from Washington that a good part of this has to do with the inadequate leadership at the Department of Defense, but we should never forget that this policy is driven by the President and the Vice President and there is a unanimity of thinking in this administration about the Middle East, the conviction that we could simply force our will on several hundred million people and bend

them to become something that we want them to become, regardless of their own intentions.

But I wanted to speak for a minute tonight about how Congress, this Republican Congress, has aided and abetted the administration by giving up its constitutional role of exercising oversight over the executive branch. It is absolutely stunning to me how both the House and the Senate have done everything that they could to rubber stamp administration policies in Iraq and cover up for them.

A few examples, going back to when Democrats controlled the Congress in the 1980s, there was an Oversight Subcommittee on Armed Services, and that oversight subcommittee discovered those \$500 hammers and \$6,000 toilet seats and put an end to much of that kind of overcharging. But when Republicans took over, they eliminated the Oversight Subcommittee on Armed Services and billions of questionable Halliburton contracts have gone unexamined, unexamined by either Armed Services or by the Intelligence Committee or the Committee on Government Reform.

The minority staff on the Committee on Government Reform has identified over 200 specific misleading statements made by the administration in the run-up to the Iraq war. Over on the Senate side, remember they had Phase II, the Senate Intelligence Committee was going to do a Phase II investigation. What they meant by that was instead of beating up on the intelligence agencies like the CIA themselves, they were going to look at the misuse of intelligence by the administration. That was Phase II of their study.

It hasn't happened. Years have gone by, and the chairman of the committee has said several times, "We are going to get to that later." But they are clearly not going to do it before any election.

In 2005, House Republicans voted down a resolution demanding an investigation of Iraq intelligence. When you look at the House and you look at the Senate, there is no question what this Republican Congress has been doing. Rather than gather information, evidence, that could clarify what has happened in the past and guide us to a better policy in the future, it is all politics all the time and that means protecting the President from being exposed, protecting the Vice President from being exposed, protecting Donald Rumsfeld from being exposed for having not spoken the truth.

So this entire Congress is complicit.

The Senate held a few hearings after Abu Ghraib, but no Senate committee has conducted a comprehensive public probe of the alleged abuses at Guantanamo Bay, Abu Ghraib, Bagram or the secret CIA facilities that the President just acknowledged yesterday.

In the House, the majorities on three House committees voted down resolutions seeking documents about detainee abuse. Democrats have been saying we need the information in order to

do a better job in the future, and Republicans have circled the wagons around the administration and refused to basically allow oversight.

On Iraq reconstruction, you go back to 2003, Donald Rumsfeld's Pentagon awarded a \$7 billion sole-source contract to Halliburton for reconstruction. And 3 years later, auditors identified more than \$1 billion in questionable and unsupported costs under that contract. A billion dollars in Washington is still real money. If Congress was simply doing its constitutionally mandated function, we would be holding hearings on that. But no, the Republicans are not prepared to investigate Halliburton. Vice President CHENEY was once the CEO of Halliburton, and this is ground we dare not go into, apparently, and yet we have to, to fulfill our constitutional responsibility.

That is what we are basically saying here. This Republican Congress has failed the country. The administration has failed the country. And when Democrats control this chamber again, whether you have a Republican President or a Democratic President, we are going to make sure that this Congress acts like the Congress contemplated in the Constitution and do our jobs.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. The gentleman from New York started and began this conversation by talking about what has transpired, and the gentleman from Maryland talked about the President and his calling over the last several days, both he and the Secretary of Defense and the Vice President have been out there, along with the Secretary of State, talking about this new agenda, and I believe the gentleman from New York has some thoughts on that.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. It seems like we are being treated to a late summer/early fall offensive, I would say smoke screen on the part of this administration to convince the American people that we need to stay the course in order to be safe.

Basically what they are doing is they are engaged in defending the indefensible. The only way they can defend a war that the American people have clearly turned against is to present it in a context that makes it appear to be reasonable or defensible, but in fact quite the opposite is the case.

I think all of us as elected officials, we have no more solemn responsibility than to provide for the safety and security of those who have elected us to represent them. But I think a fair-minded person has to look at the record of where this administration has taken this Nation and where this Congress, complicit in the strategies and objectives of this administration, have taken this country.

Every single place you look, it reeks with failure. The 9/11 Commission presented to us 41 carefully crafted bipartisan recommendations. This Congress has only acted on 20 or 21 of them. The 9/11 Commission, again a bipartisan group, has given this administration

and this Congress 14 Ds, 5 Fs and 2 incompletes on those recommendations.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. What is the Congress's report card again?

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Fourteen Ds, five Fs and two incompletes; and this is a leadership that is going to keep us safe and secure?

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. And we are approaching the fifth anniversary.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. We are approaching the fifth anniversary, and we have outstanding work on the part of this commission, bipartisan work which is what we ought to be striving for. We ought to be approaching the safety and security of this Nation in a bipartisan way.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Are any of those issues going to be brought to the floor? Those recommendations, those outstanding recommendations, will any of them be brought to the floor before we adjourn for elections?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I am not aware of anything on the calendar.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT).

Mr. DELAHUNT. If I can just go back to a point made by Tom Allen. The lack of accountability, the abrogation, if you will, of this body's constitutional responsibility to conduct oversight.

We serve on different committees. I happen to be the senior Democrat, the ranking member, on a subcommittee of International Relations that is entitled Oversight and Investigations. We have not held one serious hearing relative to Iraq in the past 2 years. And I know that, prior to that, for the past 5 years, Iraq has been off the chart in terms of the committee's considerations. You don't talk about it unless there is good news.

What I wanted to do was to bring before the committee, not Secretary Rumsfeld because we have heard enough from him. He is an F. He flunked. But I wanted to bring before the committee the men that lead our military and have served in the course of their service to this country in roles implicating Iraq, in some cases very directly in Iraq.

Not one of these men have ever been invited to any committee in the Congress so that we would have an opportunity to hear what they had to say.

So one by one, they felt compelled to speak out themselves and educate us and the American people as to the truth and the reality of Iraq and the incompetence of this administration and most specifically Donald Rumsfeld.

Let me just review a few.

Lieutenant General Greg Newbold, he is the top operations officer for the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He was involved in the planning. He is Commanding General, First Marine Division, with Legion of Merit, Navy and Marine Corps Commendation Medals. He is a highly decorated, well-respected general. He did not seek a promotion because he felt compelled to leave. Here is what he had to say.

"What we are living with now are the consequences of successive policy failures." He said that this year.

Major General Paul Eaton, who was given the responsibility but not the resources to train Iraqi security forces, and we know what a joke that has been, here is what he had to say, "Two and a half more years of that leadership," he was referring to Donald Rumsfeld and the civilian leadership, "two and a half more years of that leadership was too long for my Nation, for my Army, and for my family." What an indictment. What an indictment.

Lieutenant General John Riggs, "They only need the military advice when it satisfies their agenda." When it satisfies their agenda, that is when they would call in a general and say, This is our agenda, what do you think, General?

And then General Wesley Clark, "They pressed for open warfare before the diplomacy was finished. It was a tragic mistake. It was a strategic blunder."

□ 1715

Mr. McDERMOTT. We could go on with this for a long time, but we have got Major General John Batiste. He was the commander of the 1st Division in Iraq, and he said: "Rumsfeld and his team have turned what should have been a deliberate victory in Iraq into a prolonged challenge." I mean, that is a guy who was on the ground, who was there when the war was going on.

General Zinni, who was the central command of the whole forces, he served in every level of command, and he said: "We are paying the price for a lack of credible planning, or the lack of a plan." Ten years' worth of planning was thrown away. That is why we are in the mess we are. Because Rumsfeld said we don't need these guys like Zinni, who is my number one guy in the U.S. Central Command. That means he headed everything in the whole area of the Middle East.

Major General Swannack said: "I do not believe Secretary Rumsfeld is the right person to fight that war based on his absolute failures in managing the war against Saddam in Iraq." Now, he was commander of the 82nd Airborne. We all know about the Airborne. We know these are real soldiers. These are people who follow the leader. They do not speak out until they cannot stand it any longer.

And, finally, Lieutenant General Paul Ripper said: "If I was President, I would have relieved him 3 years ago." And he said that in 2006.

Now, this man was wounded in action in Vietnam. He won the Silver Star medal with a gold star, the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star. This man has been wounded, has stood up in the worst kind of war. And, remember, Rumsfeld never served. Bush never served. Cheney never served. Wolfowitz never served. You cannot find anybody who has ever been in a war. And the

guys who know, who have done it, who sent people out to die and been right out there with them say things like, If I was President, I would have relieved him 3 years ago. That is 2003. That is when it started, when they started ill prepared without the battle armor, without the vehicle armor, without sufficient supplies. We are going to just run in and do it, and we are going to be out in 6 months. Remember when they told that lie? And all of us stood around and said, 6 months? Really? This is going to be a cakewalk.

They didn't tell the truth to the American people or to their own troops. And that is why guys like this say get them out of there if we are going to have any change.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlemen from Maine, New York, Maryland, Massachusetts, and Washington State for coming down here this evening.

We come down here out of love of country and the desire to fulfill our constitutional responsibility. There is no doubt in my mind that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle love their country as much as we do.

I cannot understand why an administration continues to attack those who, out of love of country, speak out and dare to speak truth to power, that are willing to ask the unimagined questions and perhaps give unwelcomed answers to the administration. But that is the work that is required of elected Members of the United States Congress under our Constitution. That is our sworn obligation to the people of this great country of ours and will continue to be our obligation.

It is our sincere hope that we can move this Nation in a new direction. And with a Democratic-controlled Congress, we believe that is the best hope for our colleagues on the other side to join with us in creating what is in the best interest of our troops, our families, and the very security of this Nation.

Thank you, gentlemen, each of you, for joining us this evening.

NATIONAL SECURITY AND ELECTROMAGNETIC PULSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, among many priorities that the country and the Congress face, our national security is probably pre-eminent today in the minds of many people and in the Congress and in our administration. And today I would like to talk about one aspect of national security that will probably be unknown to a great many Americans, and to those few who know about and have studied it, this will remind them of the potential for this threat to our country, indeed, to our whole society.

Our first glimpse of the possibility of this threat occurred in 1961. It was in the Pacific and we were then doing a series of nuclear tests, and this was our first and last high altitude test. It was over Johnston Island, and the weapon was detonated above the atmosphere the first time that we had done that. No one knew what was going to happen as a result of that test, and the consequences were unexpected and really quite striking.

Hawaii was about 800 miles away. If you think back to 1961, we did not have all of the electronics that we have today. We were more in an electrical infrastructure than than we were in an electronic infrastructure, and the electrical infrastructures are very much more robust than an electronic infrastructure because you are dealing with big structures and heavy wires and so forth. Even so, the effects of this detonation above the atmosphere resulted in the shutdown of electrical circuits. There were many disruptions in electrical and certainly in electronic equipment such as existed those days in Hawaii 800 miles away. The Soviets were also doing testing simultaneously with ours and they had more experience with this phenomenon. We now have a name for this phenomenon. We call it electromagnetic pulse, or EMP.

And here I have a chart which shows very schematically what is happening. We detonate the weapon above the atmosphere, and there is an immediate distribution of gamma rays that travel at the speed of light that will strike every object within line of sight. And when these gamma rays reach our atmosphere, they produce what is called Compton electrons, all of this essentially at the speed of light, and these Compton electrons then become a force which is very much like a nuclear storm magnified many, many times. And if you think, Mr. Speaker, of the disruptions that a robust solar storm can produce to our communications here, you can get some idea as to the potential impact of an EMP. It is sometimes called high altitude or HEMP.

We since have learned a great deal more about that than we knew then, but the feature that we learned then was that wide areas are affected. You can have very high field strengths, and here it says 50 kilovolts per meter. We have since learned, as reported by the Russian generals, and I will come to that report in a few moments, that the Soviets purportedly designed and built electromagnetic weapons that would produce 200 kilovolts per meter; so that is four times larger than the number which is given here in this chart. This was May of 1986. That was 20-some years after the explosion, but a long time before these Russian generals were interviewed. There is a very broad frequency band running from very, very short wavelengths to very long wavelengths. The pulse lasts more than 2 minutes, but it comes on with such abruptness that our surge protectors for your computer and other devices

are useless because the pulse is through the surge protector before it sees it. So there is now nothing out there the equivalent of EMP.

The next chart shows on the right that just about everything is affected by EMP. It has a missile which is taking off there. We are not even sure that we can launch through a robust EMP laydown. What I am told is that we tested our missiles and we found some deficiencies and we corrected that and we have done that several times, and the last time we corrected the deficiencies, we intentionally did not test again, hoping that we had fixed all the deficiencies. But knowing that if we tested and found deficiencies that that intelligence would probably get out to our enemies and they would know that we were vulnerable, and rather than run that risk, we believe that we had corrected all the deficiencies; so we have not tested, and, hopefully, a potential enemy will also believe that we have corrected all the deficiencies. But that is not a certainty. We do not yet know for certain that we could launch our ballistic missiles through an EMP laydown. It shows effects on automobiles.

By the way, if you have a car or truck that has a coil and a distributor, you are probably immune to EMP. But all modern cars, as you know when you take your car for service, has a lot of computers. Indeed, a computer is required for servicing your car. So all of the new vehicles are vulnerable to EMP. Airplanes, only a few of our military airplanes are EMP hardened. All of the other planes are vulnerable to EMP effects.

Here on the left it shows the coverage with the height of blast 60 miles and how large an area. That is line of sight, with the simple geometry of the Earth and the height. If you are 200 miles up, you cover a bigger area. And if you are 300 miles high up with the center of that in Iowa, Nebraska, about in that area, it covers our whole country; or the margins of our country in south Florida, northwest Washington State, and Maine, all are covered with a blast of about 300 miles high above Nebraska or Iowa.

The next chart is a little more detailed presentation of the blast area. And it shows that it is not simple concentric rings because of the dynamics of the detonation of a nuclear weapon. You have a distribution of intensities; but generally speaking, out at the margins of the country with 480 kilometers, about 300 miles, with a detonation of that blast, you see from the purple here that you have got about 50 percent of maximum at the margins of our country.

The level to which we tested is classified, but if the Russian generals are correct that they developed weapons at 200 kilovolts per meter, that would mean 100 kilovolts per meter at the margins of our country. And there is concern that even when we test and harden that we may not have hardened it to an adequate level.

The next chart answers an important question that I am sure a lot of people ask at about this point, and that is if there is such enormous vulnerability to EMP, why would you be talking about that and giving our potential adversaries a heads up that we are vulnerable? To help understand that, most Americans may not know about it, but every one of our potential enemies knows about it. I have here just one little chart which, as you can see, is not in English. It is in Russian, as a matter of fact. And although I cannot read Russian, I certainly can look at the sketches here. And what we see is EMP.

□ 1730

Here is a weapon detonated above the atmosphere. And here you see the effect of that. This is the EMP pulse here lasting a long time. By the way, the fact that the wavelengths in that pulse go from extremely short to extremely long mean that they can couple with almost everything.

I am told that the smallest electronic parts on the warehouse shelf will couple with some of the shortest waves. And long, long lines like railroad tracks will couple with the longest waves. As a matter of fact, they will even couple with wires that are buried several feet underground.

Without technical knowledge, what we are talking about almost seems like Buck Rogers and science fiction. A blast of a single weapon up to 300 miles in the sky, and by the way, if it were in the daytime and you were looking away from it, you would not even know it happened. If you were looking at it, obviously, you would see it because it was very bright, and it was line of sight.

You are not hurt by it. It has no effect on our bodies. But if you have an electronic watch, that will stop. If you get in your car, that probably will not run. The phones will not work. There will be no power grid. There are literally tens of thousands of what are called SCADA, which are little control devices in our power grid. And they all contain chips, micro-electronics. And many of them were manufactured by organizations that do not even exist now because they have been in the field for a long time.

And all of those are gone. Signals traveling through fiber will get there. But if you have anything other than optical switching, if you have electronic switching, the switches will be gone. And so even if you are using fiber, you still cannot transmit your data if you are using other-than-optical switching.

So this chart demonstrates very clearly that our enemies know about EMP, because this is from a Russian publication, and it shows the effects of EMP. This is the power grid. They show the transformers going out.

By the way, if our big transformers go out, there are no replacements on the shelf. The biggest ones are not even

manufactured in this country. We will need to go to Europe or Scandinavia, and you place your order, and in a year to 18 months, they will have the transformer for you.

I was concerned about EMP, and I called a friend of mine, Tom Clancy, who I knew had an EMP scenario in one of his books. And he lives on the Eastern Shore of Maryland. I knew him. So I called Tom and asked him for some information on EMP.

He said, if you have read my book, you know as much about EMP as I know, but let me refer you to, in his opinion, the smartest man hired by the U.S. Government. And he gave me the name of a Dr. Lowell Wood who worked for Lawrence Livermore Lab, one of our big nuclear labs out in California.

Well, this was back, oh, probably 12, 13 years ago, a while ago. And cell phones were not all that popular. You may remember that we were using pagers. If you wanted to communicate with someone, why you paged them. And that went up to a satellite and back down to their pager. And they got the little message, please call so and so. I did that with Lowell Wood. I thought he was in California. And he happened to be in Washington. And of course the same satellite that would have brought the signal down to California brought it down to Washington. Within an hour, he was sitting with me in my office.

Dr. Lowell Wood was indeed a font of knowledge on electromagnetic pulse. I was concerned that, because of cost considerations, that our military was waiving EMP hardening on essentially all of its new weapons systems and that that made us vulnerable to an EMP attack.

And so I got in legislation the establishment of an EMP commission. And the EMP commission was set up and functioned for 2 years. Normally our commissions work for a year. But because of the details of this legislation, they were able to work for 2 years. They brought forth a big report. This is the executive summary of that report. And this was issued in 2004.

This is the Executive Summary of the Report of the Commission to Assess the Threat to the United States from Electromagnetic Pulse EMP Attack.

And here are a number of PowerPoint presentations that they prepared, because they were going around the country briefing a large number of organizations, Federal and State and private, on the results of their study.

The next chart shows the commissioners. Here you will see Dr. Johnnie Foster is the developer of almost all of our new atomic weapons. Dr. Bill Graham, who was the chair of this, was Rumsfeld's co-chair when they did that very important study on the emerging ballistic missile threat that came out a few years ago.

It is interesting. I spent a couple of days in Moscow with Bill Graham and Rumsfeld when we were briefing mem-

bers of the Russian Duma so that they would understand that our withdrawal from this treaty that prohibited us from protecting ourselves against intercontinental ballistic missiles had nothing to do with Russia because we cannot imagine that we could produce a robust enough protection system to protect us against the literally thousands of intercontinental ballistic missiles that Russia has. But there are some new players on the scene out there, like China and North Korea and Iran and who knows who may get in line.

And we could, we felt, with the development of a system, the successful test just a few days ago, be able to take out a few weapons from a country like this.

Another very important member of this commission was Dr. Joan Woodward, who is the deputy director of the Sandia Labs out in Albuquerque, New Mexico. I was out visiting my son there who works at the labs. And he brought me home some material from the lab that led me to believe that they might have some knowledge that would be helpful in this EMP study.

So I asked for a briefing. I had not looked at the list and remembered specifically who was on this list of commissioners. And I came in for a 5-hour classified briefing on the commission's work. And Dr. Joan Woodward had at her disposal all of the resources of the Sandia Labs. So they did a really magnificent job of studying the threat, not just to our military but to our national infrastructure.

The next chart shows something which alarmed them. This is from their commission report. We have redacted here the names of the Russian generals. But they interviewed two Russian generals who told them that Russia had designed and built a super EMP nuclear weapon capable of generating 200 kilovolts per meter. That is an enormously high pulse.

Russian, Chinese and Pakistani scientists are working in North Korea. Now, I am not saying this. I am taking this from the report of the EMP commission. Russian, Chinese and Pakistani scientists are working in North Korea and could enable that country to develop an EMP weapon in the near future. Now, this is the assessment of the EMP commission.

The next chart just builds on the point that I made that most of our citizens may not know anything about EMP, because it is really a Buck Rogers Star Wars kind of a phenomena. It almost seems like science fiction.

The fact is that, although few of our people know about EMP, all of our potential enemies know about EMP.

And I just wanted to make that very clear, because I do not want anybody to have the notion that we are somehow informing a potential enemy of something that he does not know about.

This first quote here is a very interesting one. This is not exactly the quote as I remember, but it is a pretty

good paraphrase, because I was there. It was May 2nd of 1999. And I was sitting in a hotel in Vienna, Austria, with ten other Members of our Congress and three members of the Russian Duma.

I can tell you exactly when we were there. We were there when the three prisoners, hostages, whatever you want to call them were released by Yugoslavia. You may remember that event. They were released to Jesse Jackson as you may remember.

For 2 days we sat in that hotel room hammering out a framework for an agreement. Five days later, that was voted by the G-8. Russia joined the G-7, because the only country that the Bosnians had enough respect for to be controlled by them was Russia. And when the G-7 joined with Russia, they used the framework agreement that we had developed. And that ended the hostilities there as you may remember.

Well, one of the three Russians there was Vladimir Lukin. He was the ambassador here at the end of Bush 1, the beginning of the Clinton administration. At the time we were there, he was the chair of their equivalent of our International Relations Committee in the Russian Duma.

He is a fairly short fellow with even shorter arms. And he was extremely angry. And he sat there for 2 days with his arms folded across his chest looking at the ceiling. And then he made this statement, and what he said was, as I remember it, "if we really wanted to hurt you with no threat of retaliation, we would launch an SLBM and we would detonate a nuclear weapon high above your country and shut down your power grid and your communications for 6 months or so."

That was Vladimir Lukin. Another Russian who was there, who was I think the third ranking Communist, and yes, there is still a big Communist Party in Russia, who was the third ranking Communist, Alexander Shurbanov. And he smiled and he said, "if one weapon would not do it, we have some spares, like I think at least 7,000 spares."

You see, the reason for no fear of retaliation was that if it was launched from the ocean, we would never know where it came from. Well, that was his comment.

Now, all of this is from the EMP commission. None of those are my statements. Chinese military writings describe EMP as the key to victory and describe scenarios where EMP is used against U.S. aircraft carriers in a conflict over Taiwan.

Again, a survey of worldwide military and scientific literature sponsored by the commission found widespread knowledge about EMP and its potential military utility, including in Taiwan, Israel, Egypt, India, Pakistan, Iran and North Korea.

This next bullet is kind of repeated in the next chart, so I will skip to this one. Iran has tested launching a Scud missile from a surface vessel, a launch mode that could support a national or

transnational terrorist EMP attack against the United States.

□ 1745

It should be noted that you do not have to be very technically adroit or very competent to launch an EMP weapon, because if you miss by 100 miles that is just about as good as a direct hit because there is a large area that this covers.

A Scud missile can launch about 180 miles high. That will not blanket the whole United States, but a Scud missile launched from a ship off our coast could shut down all of New England and much of the mid-Atlantic area with an EMP blast. Now, if you thought recovery from Katrina was difficult, imagine an area many times that large with no remaining infrastructure in terms of communications or power. That is the problem we would have. If it blankets our Nation, of course, we have an essentially irresolvable problem.

The next chart continues with what our potential adversaries know about EMP, and again, all of this is from the EMP commission report. If the world's industrial countries fail to devise effective ways, and this is an interesting one from Iranian Journal in 1998, even before the present wild man who is there, if the world's industrial countries fail to devise effective ways to defend themselves against dangerous electronic assaults, then they will disintegrate within a few years. 150,000 computers belong to the U.S. Army. It is probably more than that now, and if the enemy forces succeeded in infiltrating the information network, which an EMP would do if it shuts us down, then the whole organization would collapse, the American soldiers could not function, nor would they be able to fire a single shot. Now, I am not sure that is totally true, because I think our guns are pretty much immune to the EMP, but it is largely true.

We have now about 35,000 people in South Korea. We believe that with the technology we have that we are a match for the million-man North Korean Army, but if the North Koreans were to launch an EMP weapon, just fire straight up, if you will, and detonate a weapon above the atmosphere, our soldiers would, in effect, be no taller in terms of combat capability than the North Korean soldiers who probably are pretty EMP immune because they do not have very sophisticated equipment.

Terrorist information warfare includes using the technology of directed energy weapons or electromagnetic pulse. This is the Iranian Journal. Terrorists have attempted to acquire non-nuclear radio frequency weapons. This is a statement from the EMP Commission.

So you see that essentially all of our presently believed potential enemies are writing about EMP. It is not that they do not know about it, and my con-

cern is that most Americans do not know about it, which is why we are talking about it.

Why would they be interested in EMP? Again, this is from the commission. States or terrorists may well calculate that using a nuclear weapon for EMP test offers the greatest utility. We talk about asymmetric warfare. An EMP weapon is the ultimate asymmetric weapon. One little country with a Scud launcher and a crude nuclear weapon and a transsteamer from which they could launch it, and by the way, we cannot see with our satellites through the thinnest canvas. If the Scud launcher is on the deck and covered by a canvas, we could not distinguish it from baled hay or crates of bananas.

In fact, there is one interesting story on an EMP attack in our country, and this may be kind of a look at the future. It has our country attacked from the sea, and after the weapon is launched, the ship is sunk. So now even if you find the ships there are no fingerprints. The ship is gone.

Well, these are the reasons they may use it. EMP offers a bigger bang for the buck against U.S. military forces in a regional conflict or a means of damaging the U.S. homeland. There is no way that a nuclear weapon could be used to produce so much damage to our country as with an electromagnetic pulse detection by detonating it at high altitude.

If it took out all of Los Angeles or New York City, you would not have done anywhere near as much damage to our country as simply detonating it above the atmosphere and for using an EMP pulse which would shut down all of our communications and all of our power grids.

Mr. Speaker, think about a world, and it would not be quite this but nearly this, a world in which the only person you can talk to is the person next to you unless you happen to be a ham operator with a vacuum tube set, and then you could talk to another operator who had a vacuum tube set. By the way, the vacuum tubes are a million times less susceptible to EMPs than the microelectronics that we use now. And in this world, the only way pretty much you can go anywhere is to walk unless you happen to have a friend who has a car that has a coil and distributor, and that car probably will work.

The second bullet here is a very interesting one, for two reasons. The country that does this believes they are relatively immune to a massive retaliation with our nuclear weapons. Even if we knew who did it, are we justified in incinerating their grandmothers and their babies because they took out our computers? That is in effect, Mr. Speaker, all they would have done is take out our microelectronics. The consequences of that, of course, are devastating, but the second reason is that we probably would not know who did it.

I cannot imagine, except for Russia, any country that would launch a nuclear weapon from their soil. Our satellites are really good. We would certainly detect it. We would know where it came from, and we would retaliate. If they attack us, it is going to be from the sea. They cover three-fourths of the Earth's surface. They are very difficult to monitor. The north Atlantic shipping lanes are crowded with ships. It is essentially impossible to keep track of specific ships in that shipping lane.

EMP could, compared to a nuclear attack on the cities, kill many more Americans in the long run from indirect effects of collapsed infrastructure, power, communications, transportation, food and water.

I was given a prepublication copy of a novel which I hope comes out because I think Americans need to know what the potential is, and it was the story of a community in the hills of North Carolina after an EMP attack. It goes through the first year; and to give some emphasis to this statement, it could kill many more Americans. This is a novel, but they did a lot of research. They had reason to believe, I think, it was probably pretty close to the truth.

If you go to a country that has no communications and no power and will not have any communications or power and essentially no transportation because all of our transportation now except for these old cars and trucks are dependent on microelectronics, the story they told was that at the end of the first year 80 percent of the people in this North Carolina community were dead, most of them from lack of food.

The average city has 3 days' supply of food. If the trucks do not keep coming in over the superhighway, and by the way the serving of food on your plate tonight, the average serving traveled 1,500 miles to get there, to give you some idea of how vulnerable we are to transportation losses.

They were lucky, because the authors concluded in their book that probably 90 percent of our population would be dead by the end of the year, and in New York City with its millions of people, the novel at the end of the year had them with 25,000 people still alive.

These are unimaginable consequences. The effects could be just overwhelmingly devastating, and a little later I will give you some quotes from some very prominent Americans who understand, and you may be surprised of the source of these quotes when you see them.

Strategically and politically, an EMP attack can threaten entire regional or national infrastructures that are vital to U.S. military strengths and societal survival, challenge the integrity of allied regional coalitions, and pose an asymmetrical threat more dangerous to the high-tech West than to rogue states. Most of these rogue states have little microelectronics. If

we retaliate with EMP laydown, they would be a little discomfited compared to the effect on us.

The next chart is an interesting one and far too complex to go through in the few moments we have to look at it here. But they spent a lot of time looking at our national infrastructure and the interdependency of the various aspects of our infrastructure.

Their study and conclusions reminded me of the counsel of a very prominent American. This was a number of years ago, Harrison Scott Brown, from CalTech, a geophysicist who I think held a number of seminars called "The Next Hundred Years," and in those seminars, he looked at where the world might be and the various scenarios for the next hundred years.

One of the scenarios way back in the 1960s and 1950s that had been looked at was a nuclear war. He cautioned that recovery from a nuclear war would be very difficult, and what he said then is true in spades today. He noted that our very complex infrastructure was developed through an evolutionary process, through the exploitation of high-quality, readily-available raw materials, iron ore in the Midwest, which was so good that you could almost literally have a backyard smelter. There is still one of those little smelters, by the way, not working of course, just a tourist site now up near Thurmont, Maryland, not very many miles from here.

He cautioned that since our infrastructure was built with these high-quality, readily-available materials like coal that was exposed by erosion of the soil from the coal, oil that was very shallow and very abundant in Pennsylvania, that if our infrastructure collapsed, that we probably could not reestablish it without heavy industry, and heavy industry would have collapsed.

I thought just in the last day or two how appropriate his concerns were when I thought of this recent big, and it is big but it is not going to save the day, oil find in the Gulf of Mexico. How could you ever drill through 7,000 feet of water and I think about 30,000 feet of soil without the products of heavy industry? You could not, of course, and what this chart shows is that all of our infrastructure, like a house of cards, is interrelated. Any one is pulled out and the rest collapse. Of course, the one essential to everything is power. When that is gone, all is gone. Nothing works.

They spent a great deal of time, and you can get a copy of this report, and you can read the concerns that they have.

One of the few high altitude nuclear detonations, to confuse the EMP, one 300 miles will cover the whole country. Unprecedented cascading failure of our electronics-dependent infrastructure could result. I think, Mr. Speaker, we probably ought to change that verb. It would result.

Power energy transport, telecom and financial systems are particularly vul-

nerable and interdependent. EMP disruption of these sectors could cause large scale infrastructure failures for all aspects of the national life. Both civilian and military capabilities depend on these infrastructures without adequate protection, and today, we have essentially none, Mr. Speaker. Without adequate protection, recovery could be prolonged months to years.

Mr. Speaker, you cannot hold your breath for months or years. Now, all of this is from the EMP Commission set up by Public Law 106-398, title XIV. These are not my words. These are the words of the people from the EMP Commission.

The next chart, again directly from the commission, says that EMP is one of a small number of threats that may, and, boy, are they capable of understatement. These are scientists primarily, and scientists are not preachers or politicians. They are given to understatement. EMP is one of a small number of threats that may hold at risk the continued existence of today's U.S. civil society. That is the way of saying, Mr. Speaker, that EMP could end our civil society. When they say "hold at risk the continued existence," that means discontinue the society, disrupt our military forces and disrupt our ability to project military power.

Far too many of our weapons systems are not hardened. At a series of hearings over the last several years, I have frequently asked, after a robust EMP laydown, how much of our war fighting capability remains? And the short answer is, usually not much.

□ 1800

Now, that is about to change, because I now understand that a memo is circulating in the Pentagon asking all of our departments there to make an assessment of their EMP vulnerabilities. Hopefully, that will result in a program to correct this deficiency.

The number of U.S. adversaries capable of EMP attack is greater than in the Cold War. Then there was one. Today, who knows how many there are. Any country that has a crude nuclear weapon that they might make or buy, a Scud launcher and a transsteamer they can put it on is capable; not of blanketing our whole country, but taking out the whole northeast and Mid-Atlantic area would be devastating. This would be orders of magnitude greater than Katrina, and we still really haven't recovered from that one.

Potential adversaries are aware of the EMP strategic attack option. I read earlier a number of quotes from the commission, from journals in these foreign countries noting that they really know about it, the threat not adequately addressed in U.S. national and homeland security programs. I said, Mr. Speaker, they were capable of gross understatement. We are paying essentially no attention to it.

You know, my house is probably not going to burn down, but I wouldn't sleep well tonight, I wouldn't sleep tonight if I knew that I didn't have fire

insurance on my home. I would want to call the agent and get a binder. Now, what are the odds that my house is going to burn tonight? Very small. I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that in the reality of today's world, there is a bigger probability that there will be an EMP laydown than that any one house or building will burn. Now, if you are uncomfortable being unprotected by fire insurance, you really ought to be uncomfortable being unprotected from EMP.

The next chart shows the conclusions of the EMP Commission. The EMP threat is one of a few potentially catastrophic threats to the United States. As a matter of fact, there is almost no other single event that you can name, except the impact of a large meteor from space perhaps, that you could note that would have the devastating effects of an EMP laydown. By taking action, the EMP threat can be reduced to manageable levels. And they have a large number of pages and a lot of recommendations.

We just recently extended the life of the EMP Commission for 18 months after their first meeting, and their first meeting was just a few weeks ago. So the EMP Commission, unlike most commissions doing this kind of work, they produce a paper, and then the report just collects dusts, and they go away. But this one is not going away, and I hope we can keep it in existence for a long time.

The EMP Commission needs to be there watching our response to make sure that we are doing the right thing. They now have an extension of life of about 18 months. They are a few weeks into that, so they are going around educating people, sectors of government, private sector and so forth.

By taking action, this EMP threat could be reduced. It could be reduced to manageable levels. If you are building a device, and EMP hardened, it may increase the cost of the device only 5 or 10 percent, maybe even less. If you wait until after the device is built, it may cost you as much to harden the device as it did to build it. If you are building in the hardening, it is not all that expensive or not all that difficult.

The strategy to address the EMP threat should balance prevention, and that is telling other people you do this, you are going to pay for it; preparation, protection and recovery. We need to be looking at all of these.

A fascinating study is, what would you do if this happened? What resources do you have available? How would you mobilize those resources? What would you do to provide the most good for the most people with the resources you have available? These are fascinating studies, and essentially nobody is looking at them.

Critical military capabilities must be survivable; and they are not today, I hope we are moving to address that; and endurable to underwrite U.S. strategy.

The next chart shows a continuation of their conclusions, and this reflects

that, in the 2006 Defense Authorization, we extended it for 18 months.

Terrorists are looking for vulnerabilities to attack, and our civilian infrastructure is particularly susceptible to this kind of an attack.

Vulnerability invites attack. I really am a pacifist. I don't like war. That is why I am a big, big supporter of our military, because I really subscribe to the philosophy that the most certain path to peace is to prepare for war. If you are really prepared for war, you are probably not going to have a war. We are not prepared for this kind of an eventuality, and our very unpreparedness invites this kind of an asymmetric attack.

The Department of Homeland Security needs to identify critical infrastructure. And what do we do to protect it? And what do we do to recover? And it notes here that the power grid is a particularly vulnerable and essential one. Without power, you have essentially nothing. Everything goes down without power.

The Department of Homeland Security also needs to develop a plan to help citizens deal with such an attack should it occur. What do you do as a family to prepare? What do you do as a community to prepare? What do you do when it happens? Citizens need to become as self-sufficient as possible.

I am not telling you this; I am reading this from the report. If you are not as self-sufficient as possible, then you become a liability. You are no longer an asset to your country. You become a liability. So it should be the goal of every American to be as self-sufficient as possible, because then you become an asset and not a liability.

The next quote is a really interesting one, and I mentioned some really prominent Americans are concerned about this, and so this is from the Washington Post, "One Way We Could Lose the War on Terror" by U.S. Senator JON KYL from Arizona. "Last week, the Senate Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Terrorism, Technology and Homeland Security, which I chair," he says, "held a hearing on a major threat to the United States not only from terrorists but from rogue nations like North Korea. An electromagnetic pulse, an EMP attack, is one of only a few ways America could be essentially defeated by our enemies, terrorists or otherwise. Few, if any, people would die right away, but the long-term loss of electricity would essentially bring our society to a halt. Few could conceive of a possibility that terrorists could bring American society to its knees by knocking out our power supply from several miles in the atmosphere, but this time, we've been warned, and we better be prepared to respond."

Thank you, Senator KYL. Thank you for your recognition that this is a problem. Thank you for your counsel that we ought to be doing something about it. But, you know, I still don't see us doing much about it.

Another article that appeared in the public, "The Impact of EMP is Asymmetric." This is by Major Franz Gayl. "The impact of EMP is asymmetric in relation to our adversaries. The less developed societies of North Korea, Iran and other potential EMP attack perpetrators are less electromagnetically dependent and less specialized and are more capable of continued functionality in the absence of modern conveniences."

If you don't have modern conveniences, you are not going to miss modern conveniences.

"Conversely, the United States would be subject to widespread paralysis and doubtful recovery," he says. That really is true, doubtful recovery, "following a surprise EMP attack. Therefore, terrorists and their coincidentally allied state sponsors may determine that, given just a few nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles, the subjection of the United States to a potentially non-attributable," from the sea, from above, "nonattributable EMP attack is more desirable than the destruction of selected cities." I would think so.

"Delayed mass lethality is assured over time through the cascade of EMPs indirect effects that would bring our highly specialized and urbanized society to a disorderly halt." That is a very euphemistic way, Mr. Speaker, of saying that most of us would die.

The next chart shows the capability, which we exercised and have now mothballed, where we could put a whole airplane and zap the airplane. Now, this is not quite a realistic simulation of an EMP attack, but it is the best we could do, because there are no long line effects here. You just can't simulate miles of wire and railroad tracks. But we used to have these facilities, and we have now mothballed them. We used to test our airplanes. And some of our most important airplanes are hardened. Indeed, those which are hardened are, obviously, classified. But it is not that we would not have an ability to respond. We would. But to whom? Who did it? And what would be our response?

Mr. Speaker, we have spent several minutes now talking about a threat which I suspect few listeners had any idea existed. I hope that quoting this report and high profile people like JON KYL has convinced the listener that this is not just science fiction, that this is a real possibility indeed.

If there is going to be a conflict, Mr. Speaker, with these powers, I think it is more than a possibility, I think it is a probability that any of these small adversaries that have a nuclear weapon could devastate us more with an EMP laydown than with any other use of that weapon. And the reason I am here in this time that we are talking about national security, Mr. Speaker, is because I believe that, although there are more urgent concerns about national security, like an open border through which 11, 12, 20, who knows how many million illegal immigrants could come,

there could just as well have been that many terrorists. By the way, there is an old adage that talks about the tyranny of the urgent.

Iraq and what we are doing there is really urgent. Every day it is on the President's plate. The border and the outrage of American citizens that we haven't been able to close that border is really urgent. And it is just a truism for families, for businesses, for countries, the tyranny of the urgent. The urgent always sweeps the important off the table. And one of the really important things that we need to be about is preparing for the eventuality of an EMP laydown.

My last chart is a kind of a colorful one. This is a satellite photograph of the Ural Mountains, and it is labeled the Yamantau region in Russia. And this facility is ordinarily spoken of as Yamantau Mountain because it is in a mountain, and you can see from the figure down in the lower right there, it is about 600 miles almost due east of Moscow in the Ural Mountains.

Beginning with Brezhnev, in about 1980, the Soviets, and now the Russians, have a closed city there. In our liaison with the Russian Duma, we have become fairly friendly with a number of those Duma members, our counterparts there, and we asked them about closed cities. And they say, oh, yes, we have closed cities. When you draw a map of the region, the city is not even on the map. It is closed. People don't go there unless they are needed to work there, and they do not leave there unless they are no longer needed there.

Mezhhgorye is the closed city. It happens to be in two little pockets in the mountains, because one valley wasn't big enough to house it, but there were at one time 60,000 people that we could estimate from our satellite living there. That would be about 20,000 workers that were working on Yamantau Mountain.

Yamantau Mountain is the largest nuclear secure facility in the world. We have had two defectors from that Yamantau Mountain. They each have told us what they know.

□ 1815

What we know from what they told us is that it is enormously large, as large as inside our beltway; it has train tracks running in two directions, so they intend to move a lot of material; and it has enormous rooms carved out of soft rock beneath hard rock. It is an ideal geologic formation for producing this kind of a facility.

The number of people at Mezhhgorye, since they are finished digging, has now shrunk to about 15,000, as our satellites indicate, which means there are about 5,000 working at Yamantau Mountain.

What are they doing there? By the way, this is so secret in Russia that the cost of this, which has to be enormous, does not show in the financial lines of any of the ministries. It is the equivalent

of our black programs, for those of you who are familiar with black programs.

To give you some idea how important this is to the Russians, continuing work on Yamantau Mountain is more important than paying their military officers, because they have continued work there when they couldn't pay their military officers. It is more important to them than the \$200 million for the service module on the International Space Station. That was embarrassing to them when they couldn't fund that and we had to fund the service module, which was their responsibility, on the International Space Station.

Now, there is no conceivable use of Yamantau Mountain except during or after a nuclear war. This kind of gives you a little opportunity to get into the heads of the Russian leaders. From their writings and from their actions, it is quite justified to draw the conclusion that they believe that nuclear war is inevitable and winnable.

Now, I have no idea, and I have had a number of classified briefings, I have no idea what they plan to do in Yamantau Mountain. But one thing is certain, it has no use except during or after a nuclear war.

I wanted to end with this, Mr. Speaker, to bring the message that nuclear war is not unthinkable and therefore it will not happen, because apparently the Russians do not believe that it is unthinkable.

By the way, they span 11 time zones. Their enormous country goes almost halfway around the world. They have less than half the people that we have and a geography that size, I think only six cities of more than 1 million people. And if wealth is determined by natural resources and raw materials, Russia is the wealthiest country on the globe. They have everything their heart could desire, except a rational government, their heart could desire for a robust economic system. They could close the door and with their resources live happily ever after.

Almost nobody else can do that. We cannot do that. We import about two-thirds of our oil, we have no diamonds, nickel, chromium, tungsten. You would not have these lights in the ceiling without importing things.

So I just wanted to end, Mr. Speaker, with this chart which shows that our potential enemies believe that there could be a nuclear war and they are preparing for it by spending money on Yamantau Mountain, scarce money.

They were doing this, by the way, when money was scarce. It is not scarce now. They are awash in cash because oil is \$65, \$70, \$75 a barrel. But they were spending money on this before they were flush with money.

So my hope is, and I believe we should have time, that the American people in our society and in our military can plan, adapt, design, build, so that we will be immune.

We are much more likely to have this attack if we are vulnerable to the at-

tack, and at the moment we are explicitly vulnerable. We don't need to be that way. The creativity and ingenuity of the American people can make us essentially immune to this, Mr. Speaker, and we need to be about it.

BIG-GOVERNMENT SOLUTIONS DON'T WORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, politicians throughout history have tried to solve every problem conceivable to man, always failing to recognize that many of the problems we face result from previous so-called political solutions.

Government cannot be the answer to every human ill. Continuing to view more government as the solution to problems will only make matters worse.

Not long ago, I spoke on this floor about why I believe Americans are so angry in spite of rosy government economic reports. The majority of Americans are angry, disgusted, and frustrated that so little is being done in Congress to solve their problems. The fact is, a majority of American citizens expect the Federal Government to provide for every need without considering whether government causes many economic problems in the first place. This certainly is an incentive for politicians to embrace the role of omnipotent problem-solvers, since nobody asked first whether they, the politicians themselves, are at fault.

At home, I am frequently asked about my frustration with Congress since so many reform proposals go unheeded. I jokingly reply, No, I am never frustrated because I have such low expectations. But the American people have higher expectations, and without forthcoming solutions are beyond frustrated with their government.

If solutions to American problems won't be found in the frequent clamor for more government, it still is up to Congress to explain how our problems developed and how solutions can be found in an atmosphere of liberty, private property, and a free market order.

It is up to us to demand radical change from our failed policy of foreign military interventionism. Robotic responses to clichés of Big Government intervention in our lives are unbecoming to Members who are elected to offer ideas and solutions. We must challenge the status quo of our economic and political system.

Many things have contributed to the mess we are in. Bureaucratic management can never compete with the free market in solving problems.

Central economic planning doesn't work. Just look at the failed systems of the 20th century. Welfarism is an example of central economic planning. Paper money, money created out of thin air to accommodate welfarism and government deficits, is not only silly;

it is unconstitutional. No matter how hard the big spenders try to convince us otherwise, deficits do matter. But lowering the deficit through higher taxes won't solve anything.

Nothing will change in Washington until it is recognized that the ultimate driving force behind most politicians is obtaining and holding power, and money from special interests drives the political process.

Money and power are important only because the government wields power not granted by the Constitution. A limited constitutional government would not tempt special interests to buy the politicians who wield power. The whole process feeds on itself. Everyone is rewarded by ignoring constitutional restraints while expanding and complicating the entire bureaucratic state.

Even when it is recognized that we are traveling down the wrong path, the lack of political courage and the desire for reelection results in ongoing support for the pork-barrel system that serves special interests.

A safe middle ground, a don't-rock-the-boat attitude, too often is rewarded in Washington, while meaningful solutions tend to offend those who are in charge of the gigantic PAC lobbyist empire that calls the shots in Washington.

Most Members are rewarded by reelection for accommodating and knowing how to work the system. Though there is little difference between the two parties, the partisan fights are real. Instead of debates about philosophy, though, the partisan battles are about who will wield the gavels. True political debates are rare. Power struggles are real and ruthless, and yet we all know that power corrupts.

Both parties agree on monetary, fiscal, foreign and entitlement policies. Unfortunately, neither party has much concern for civil liberties. Both parties are split over trade, with mixed debates between outright protections and those who endorse government-managed trade agreements that masquerade as free trade.

It is virtually impossible to find anyone who supports hands-off free trade defended by the moral right of all citizens to spend their money as they see fit without being subject to any special interest.

The Big Government nanny state is based on the assumption that free markets cannot provide the maximum good for the largest number of people. It assumes people are not smart or responsible enough to take care of themselves, and thus their needs must be filled through the government's forcible redistribution of wealth.

Our system of intervention assumes that politicians and bureaucrats have superior knowledge and are endowed with certain talents that produce efficiency. These assumptions don't seem to hold much water, of course, when we look at agencies like FEMA. Still, we expect the government to manage monetary and economic policy, the medical

system and the educational system, and then wonder why we have problems with the cost and efficiency of all these programs.

On top of this, the daily operation of Congress reflects the power of special interests, not the will of the people, regardless of which party is in power. Critically important legislation comes up for votes late in the evening without much warning, leaving Members little chance to read or study the bills. Key changes are buried in conference reports, often containing new legislation not even mentioned in either the House or the Senate versions.

Conferences were meant to compromise two different positions in the House and Senate, not to slip in new material that had not been mentioned in either bill.

Congress spends hundreds of billions of dollars in emergency supplemental bills to avoid the budgetary rules meant to hold down the deficit. War-time spending money is appropriated and attached to emergency relief funds, making it difficult for politicians to resist. The principle of the pork barrel is alive and well, and it shows how huge appropriations are passed easily with supporters of the system getting their share for their district.

Huge omnibus spending bills introduced at the end of legislative years are passed without scrutiny. No one individual knows exactly what is in the bill. In the process, legitimate needs and constitutional responsibilities are frequently ignored. Respect for private property rights is ignored. Confidence in the free market is lost or misunderstood. Our tradition of self-reliance is mocked as archaic.

Lack of real choice in economic and personal decisions is commonplace. It seems that too often the only choice we are given is between prohibitions and subsidies. Never is it said, let the people decide on things like stem cell research or alternative medical treatments.

Nearly everyone endorses exorbitant taxation. The only debate is about who should pay. Either tax the producers and the rich, or tax the workers and the poor through inflation and outsourcing jobs.

Both politicians and the media place blame on everything except bad policy authored by the Congress. Scapegoats are needed since there is so much blame to go around and so little understanding as to why we are in such a mess.

In the 1920s and the 1930s, Europe's financial system collapsed and inflation raged. It was commonplace to blame the Jews. Today, in America the blame is spread out: illegal immigrants, Muslims, big business, whether they got special deals from the government or not, price gouging oil companies, regardless of the circumstances, and labor unions. Ignorance of economics and denial of the political power system that prevails in the District of Columbia makes it possible for Congress to shift the blame.

Since we are not on the verge of mending our ways, the problems will worsen and the blame game will get much more vicious. Shortchanging a large segment of our society surely will breed conflict that could get out of control.

This is a good reason for us to cast aside politics as usual and start finding some reliable answers to our problems. Politics as usual is aided by the complicity of the media. Economic ignorance, bleeding heart emotionalism, and populist passion pervade our major networks and cable channels.

This is especially noticeable when the establishment seeks to unify the people behind an illegal, unwise war. The propaganda is well coordinated by the media, government and military-industrial complex. This collusion is worse than when state-owned media do the same thing.

In countries where everyone knows the media produces government propaganda, people remain wary of what they hear.

□ 1830

In the United States, the media are considered free and independent. Thus, the propaganda is accepted with less questioning.

One of the major reasons we have drifted from the Founders' vision of liberty in the Constitution was the division of the concept of freedom into two parts. Instead of freedom being applied equally to social and economic transactions, it has come to be thought of as two different concepts. Some in Congress now protect economic liberty and market choices but ignore personal liberty and private choices. Others defend personal liberty but concede the realm of property and economic transaction to government control.

There should be no distinction between commercial speech and political speech with no consistent moral defense of true liberty. The continued erosion of personal property rights is inevitable.

This careless disregard for liberty, our traditions and the Constitution, have brought us disaster with a foreign policy of military interventionism supported by the leadership of both parties. Hopefully, some day, this will be radically changed.

Everyone is aware of the law of unintended consequences. Most Members of Congress understand that government actions can have unintended consequences. Yet few quit voting for government solutions, always hoping there won't be any particular unintended consequences the next time.

They keep hoping there will be less harmful complications from the solution that they are currently supporting. Free market economics teaches us that for every government action to solve an economic problem, two new ones are created. The same unwanted results occur with foreign policy meddling. The law of opposites is just a variation of the law of unintended consequences. When we attempt to achieve

a certain goal, like, say, make the world safe for democracy, a grandiose scheme of World War I, one can be sure the world will become less safe and less democratic regardless of the motivation. The First World War was sold to the American people as the war to end all wars.

Instead, history shows it was the war that caused the 20th Century to be the most war-torn century in all of history. Our entry into World War I helped lead us into World War II, the Cold War, the Korean War and the Vietnam War. Even our current crisis in the Middle East can be traced to the great wars of the 20th Century.

Though tens of millions of deaths are associated with these wars, it seems we haven't learned a thing. We went into Korea by direction of the United Nations, not a Congressional declaration of war, to unify Korea. Yet that war ensured that Korea remained divided to this day. Our troops are still there. South Korea today is much more willing to reconcile differences with North Korea, and yet we obstruct such efforts. It doesn't make much sense.

We went into Vietnam and involved ourselves unnecessarily in the civil war to bring peace and harmony to that country. We lost 60,000 troops and spent hundreds of billions of dollars, yet failed to achieve victory. Ironically, since losing in Vietnam, we now have a better relationship with them than ever. We now trade, invest, travel and communicate with a unified Western-leaning country that is catching on quickly to capitalist ways. This policy, not military confrontation, is exactly what the Constitution permits and the Founders encouraged in our relationship with others.

This policy should apply to both friends and perceived enemies. Diplomacy and trade can accomplish goals that military intervention cannot, and they certainly are a lot less costly.

In both instances, Korea and Vietnam, neither country attacked us, and neither country posed a threat to our national security.

In neither case did we declare war. All of the fighting and killing was based on lies, miscalculations and the failure to abide by constitutional restraint with regard to war.

When goals are couched in terms of humanitarianism, sincere or not, the results are inevitably bad. Foreign interventionism requires the use of force. First, the funds needed to pursue a particular policy required that taxes be forcibly imposed on the American people either directly or indirectly through inflation. Picking sides in foreign countries only increases the chances of antagonism toward us.

Too often, foreign economic and military support means impoverishing the poor in America and enhancing the rich ruling classes in poor countries. When sanctions are used against one undesirable regime, it squelches the resistance to the very regimes we are trying to undermine.

Forty years of sanctions against Castro have left him in power and fomented continued hatred and blame from the Cuban people directed at us. Trade with Cuba likely would have accomplished the opposite, as it has in Vietnam, China and even the Eastern Bloc nations of the old Soviet empire.

We spend billions of dollars in Afghanistan and Colombia to curtail drug production. No evidence exists that it helps. In fact, drug production and corruption have increased in both countries. We close our eyes to it because the reasons we are in Colombia and Afghanistan are denied.

Obviously, we are not putting forth the full effort required to capture Osama bin Laden. Instead, our occupation of Afghanistan further inflames the Muslim radicals that came of age with their fierce resistance to the Soviet occupation of a Muslim country. Our occupation merely serves as a recruiting device for al Qaeda, which has promised retaliation for our presence in their country.

We learn nothing, after first allying ourselves with Osama bin Laden when he applied the same logic towards the Soviets. The net result of our invasion and occupation in Afghanistan has been to miss capturing Osama bin Laden, assist al Qaeda's recruitment, stimulate more drug production and lose hundreds of American lives and allow spending of billions of American taxpayers dollars with no end in sight.

Bankruptcy seems to be the only way we will reconsider the foolishness of this type of occupation. It is time for us to wake up.

Our policy toward Iran for the past 50 years is every bit as disconcerting. It makes no sense, however, unless one concedes that our government is manipulated by those who seek physical control over the vast riches of the Middle East and egged on by Israel's desires. We have attacked the sovereignty of Iran on two occasions and are in the process of threatening her for the third time.

In 1953, the U.S. and British overthrew the democratically elected Mohammed Mossadegh and installed the Shah. His brutal regime lasted for over 25 years and ended with the Ayatollah taking power in 1979. Our support for the Shah incited the radicalization of the Shiite clerics in Iran, resulting in the hostage takeover.

In the 1980s, we provided weapons, including poisonous gas, to Saddam Hussein, as we supported his invasion of Iran. These events are not forgotten by the Iranians, who, once again, see us looking for another confrontation with them.

We insist that the U.N. ignore the guarantees under the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty that grants countries like Iran the right to enrich uranium. The pressure on the U.N. and the threats we cast toward Iran are quite harmful to the cause of peace. They are entirely unnecessary and serve no useful purpose. Our policy toward Iran is

much more likely to result in her getting a nuclear weapon than preventing it.

Our own effort at democratizing Iran has resulted, instead, in radicalizing a population whose instincts are to like Americans and our economic system. Our meddling these past 50 years has only served to alienate and unify the entire country against us. Though our officials only see Iran as an enemy, as does Israel, our policies in the Middle East these past 5 years have done wonders to strengthen Iran's political and military position in the region. We have totally ignored serious overtures by the Iranians to negotiate with us before hostilities broke out in Iraq in 2003.

Both immediately after 9/11 and especially at the time of our invasion in Iraq in 2003, Iran particularly, partially out of fear and realism, honestly sought reconciliation and offered to help the U.S. in its battle against al Qaeda. They were rebuked outright.

Now, Iran is negotiating from a much stronger position, principally as a result of our overall Middle East policy.

We accommodated Iran by severely weakening the Taliban in Afghanistan on Iran's eastern borders. On Iran's western borders, we helped Iranians by eliminating their arch enemy, Saddam Hussein. Our invasion in Iraq and the resulting chaos have inadvertently delivered up a large portion of Iraq to the Iranians, as the majority Shiites in Iraq ally themselves with the Iranians.

The U.S.-Israel plan to hit Hezbollah in Lebanon before taking on Iran's military has totally backfired. Now Hezbollah, an ally of Iran, has been made stronger than ever with the military failure to route Hezbollah from southern Lebanon.

Before the U.S.-Israeli invasion of Lebanon, Hezbollah was supported by 20 percent of the population. Now its revered by 80 percent. A democratic election in Lebanon cannot now serve the interests of the U.S. or Israel; it would only support the cause of radical clerics in Iran.

Demanding an election in Palestinian Gaza resulted in enhancing the power of Hamas. The U.S. and Israel promptly rejected the results. So much for our support for democratically elected government. Our support for dictatorial Arab leaders remains a thorn in the side of the large Muslim population in the Middle East and one of the main reasons Osama bin Laden declared war against us.

We talk of democracy and self-determination, but the masses of people in the Middle East see through our hypocrisy when we support the Sunni secular dictators in Saudi Arabia, Egypt and Jordan and, at one time, Saddam Hussein.

In the late 1970s and the late 1980s, the CIA spent over \$4 billion on a program called Operation Cyclone. This was our contribution to setting up training schools in Pakistan and elsewhere, including the U.S. itself, to

teach sabotage skills. The purpose was to use these individuals in fighting our enemies in the Middle East, including the Soviets. But as one could predict, this effort has come back to haunt us as our radical ally, Osama bin Laden, turned his fury against us after routing the Soviets.

It is estimated that over 12,000 fighters were trained in the camps we set up in Afghanistan. They were taught how to make bombs, carry out sabotage and use guerrilla war tactics, and now we are on the receiving end of this U.S.-financed program, hardly a good investment. It is difficult to understand why our policymakers aren't more cautious in their effort to police the world once they realize how unsuccessful we have been. It seems they always hope that the next time our efforts won't come flying back in our face.

Our failed efforts in Iraq continue to drain our resources, costing us dearly both in lives lost and dollars spent, and there is no end in sight. No consideration is given for rejecting our obsession with a worldwide military presence which rarely, if ever, directly enhances our security.

A much stronger case can be made that our policy of protecting our worldwide interest actually does the opposite by making us weaker, alienating our allies, inciting more hatred and provoking our enemies. The more we have interfered in the Middle East the past 50 years, the greater the danger has become for an attack on us.

The notion that Arab Muslim radicals are motivated to attack us because of our freedoms and prosperity and not our unwelcome presence in their country is dangerous and silly.

We were told we needed to go into Iraq because our old ally, Saddam Hussein, had weapons of mass destruction. Yet no weapons of mass destruction were found. We were told we needed to occupy Iraq to remove al Qaeda, yet al Qaeda was nowhere to be found. And now it is admitted it had nothing to do with 9/11.

Yet, today, Iraq is infested with al Qaeda, achieving exactly the opposite of what we sought to do. We were told that we needed to secure our oil to protect our economy and to pay for our invasion and occupation. Instead, the opposite has resulted. Oil production is down. Oil prices are up, and no oil profits have been used to pay the bills. We were told that a regime change in Iraq would help us in our long-time fight with Iran, yet everything we have done in Iraq has served the interests of Iran.

□ 1845

We are being told in a threatening and intimidating fashion that if America were to pull out before Iraq could defend itself, the consequences would be absolutely predictable and absolutely disastrous. I am convinced, though, that the law of opposites could well apply here. Going into Iraq we know produced exactly the opposite results of what was predicted. Leaving

also likely will have results opposite of those we are being frightened with. Certainly leaving Vietnam at the height of the Cold War did not result in the disaster predicted by the advocates of the domino theory: an inevitable Communist takeover of the entire Far East.

We are constantly being told that we cannot abandon Iraq, and we are obligated to stay forever if necessary. This admonition is similar to a rallying cry from a determined religious missionary bent on proselytizing to the world with a particular religious message. Conceding that leaving may not be a panacea for Iraqi tranquility, this assumption ignores two things: One, our preemptive war ignited the Iraqi civil war; and, two, abandoning the Iraqi people is not the question. The real question is whether or not we should abandon the American people by forcing them to pay for an undeclared war with huge economic and human costs while placing our national security in greater jeopardy by ignoring our borders and serious problems here at home.

In our attempt to make Iraq a better place, we did great harm to the Iraqi Christians. Before our invasion in 2003, there were approximately 1.2 million Christians living in Iraq. Since then, over half have been forced to leave due to persecution and violence. Many escaped to Syria. With the neocons wanting to attack Syria, how long will they be safe there? The answer to the question, aren't we better off without Saddam Hussein, is not an automatic "yes" for Iraqi Christians.

We have been told for decades that our policy of militarism and preemption in the Middle East is designed to provide security for Israel. Yet a strong case can be made that Israel is more vulnerable now than ever with moderate Muslims being challenged by a growing majority of Islamic radicals. As the invincibility of the American and Israeli military becomes common knowledge, Israel's security is diminished, and world opinion turns against her, especially after the failed efforts to remove Hezbollah from southern Lebanon.

We were told that attacking and eliminating Hezbollah was required to diminish the Iranian threat against Israel. The results again were the opposite. This failed effort has only emboldened Iran. The lack of success of conventional warfare, the U.S. in Vietnam, the Soviets in Afghanistan, the U.S. in Iraq and Afghanistan, Israel in Lebanon, should awaken our policymakers to our failure in war and diplomacy. Yet all we propose are bigger bombs and more military force for occupation rather than working to understand an entirely new generation of modern warfare.

Many reasons are given for our preemptive wars and military approach for spreading the American message of freedom and prosperity, which is an obvious impossibility. Our vital interests are always cited for justification, and

it is inferred that those who do not support our militancy are unpatriotic. Yet the opposite is actually the case: Wise resistance to one's own government doing bad things requires a love of country, devotion to idealism and respect for the rule of law.

In attempting to build an artificial and unwelcome Iraqi military, the harder we try, the more money we spend and the more lives we lose, the stronger the real armies of Iraq become: The Sunni insurgency, the Badr Brigade, the Sadr Mahdi Army and the Kurdish Militia.

The Kurds have already taken a bold step in this direction by hoisting a Kurdish flag and removing the Iraqi flag, a virtual declaration of independence. Natural local forces are winning out over outside political forces.

We are looking in all of the wrong places for an Iraqi army to bring stability to that country. The people have spoken, and these troops that represent large segments of the population need no training. It is not a lack of training, weapons or money that hinders our efforts to create a new superior Iraqi military. It is the lack of inspiration and support for such an endeavor that is missing. Developing borders and separating the various factions, which our policy explicitly prohibits, is the basic flaw in our plan for a forced, unified Western-style democracy for Iraq. Allowing self-determination for different regions is the only way to erase the artificial nature of Iraq, an Iraq designed by Western outsiders nearly 80 years ago. It is our obsession with control of the oil in the region and imposing our will on the Middle East and accommodating the demands of Israel that is the problem. And the American people are finally getting sick and tired of all of their sacrifices. It is time to stop the bleeding.

Instead we continue to hear the constant agitation for us to confront the Iranians with military action. Reasons to attack Iran make no more sense than our foolish preemptive war against Iraq. Fictitious charges and imaginary dangers are used to frighten the American people into accepting an attack on Iran. First it may only be sanctions, but later it will be bombs and possible ground troops if the neocons have their way. Many of the chicken-hawk neoconservative advisors to the administration are highly critical of our current policy because it is not aggressive enough. They want more troops in Iraq. They want to attack Syria and Iran and escalate the conflict in Lebanon.

We have a troop shortage. Morale is low, and our military equipment is in bad shape, yet the neocons would not hesitate to spend, borrow, inflate and reinstate the draft to continue their grandiose schemes in remaking the entire Middle East. Obviously, a victory of this sort is not available no matter what effort is made or how much money is spent.

Logic would tell us there is no way we will contemplate taking on Iran at

this time, but logic did not prevail with our Iraq policy and look at the mess we have there. Besides, both sides, the neoconservative extremists and the radical Islamists, are driven by religious fervor. Both are convinced that God is on their side, a strange assumption since theologically it is the same God.

Both sides of the war in the Middle East are driven by religious beliefs of omnipotence. Both sides endorse an eschatological theory regarding the forthcoming end of time. Both anticipate the return of God personified and as promised to each. Both sides are driven by a conviction of perfect knowledge regarding the Creator, and though we supposedly worship the same God, each sees the other side as completely wrong and blasphemous. The religiously driven Middle East war condemns tolerance of the other's view. Advocates of restraint and the use of diplomacy are ridiculed as appeasers and equivalent to supporting Nazism and considered un-American and un-Christian.

I find it amazing that we in this country seem determined to completely separate religious expression and the state, even to the detriment of the first amendment, yet we can say little about how Christian and Jewish religious beliefs greatly influence our policies in the Middle East? It should be the other way around. Religious expression, according to the First Amendment, cannot be regulated anywhere by Congress or the Federal courts. But deeply held theological beliefs should never dictate our foreign policy. Being falsely accused of anti-Semitism and being a supporter of radical fascism is not an enviable position for any politician. Most realize it is best to be quiet and support our Middle East involvement.

Believing one can have perfect knowledge of God's will and believing government can manage our lives and world affairs have caused a great deal of problems for man over the ages. When these two elements are combined, they become especially dangerous. Liberty, by contrast, removes power from government and allows total freedom of choice in pursuing one's religious beliefs. The only solution to controlling political violence is to prohibit the use of force to pursue religious goals and reject government authority to mold the behavior of individuals.

Both sides in the Middle East are enamored with the so-called benefit that chaos offers to those promoting revolutionary changes. Both sides in situations like this always underestimate the determination of the opposition and ignore the law of unintended consequences. They never consider that these policies might backfire.

Declaring war against Islamic fascism or terrorism is vague and meaningless. The enemy that we are fighting at the expense of our own liberties is purposely indefinable. Therefore the

government will exercise wartime powers indefinitely. We have been fully warned to expect a long, long war.

The Islamic fascists are almost impossible to identify and cannot be targeted by our conventional weapons. Those who threaten us essentially are unarmed and stateless. Comparing them to Nazi Germany, a huge military power, is ridiculous. Labeling them as a unified force is a mistake. It is critical that we figure out why a growing number of Muslims are radicalized to the point of committing suicide terrorism against us. Our presence in their countries represents a failed policy that makes us less safe, not more.

These guerilla warriors do not threaten us with tanks, gunboats, missiles or nuclear weapons, nor do they have a history of aggression against the United States. Our enemies' credibility depends instead on the popular goal of ending our occupation of their country.

We must not forget that the 9/11 terrorists came principally from Saudi Arabia, not Iraq, Iran, Lebanon or Syria. Iran has never in modern times invaded her neighbors, yet we worry obsessively that she may develop a nuclear weapon some day. Never mind that a radicalized Pakistan has nuclear weapons and our so-called friend Musharraf won't lift a finger against bin Laden who most likely is hiding in Pakistan. Our only defense against this emerging nuclear threat has been to use and threaten to use weapons that do not meet the needs of this new and different enemy.

Since resistance against the Iraq war is building here at home, hopefully it will not be too long before we abandon our grandiose scheme to rule the entire Middle East through intimidation and military confrontation.

But economic law eventually will prevail. Runaway military and entitlement spending cannot be sustained. We can tax the private economy only so much, and borrowing from foreigners is limited by the total foreign debt and our current account deficit. It will be difficult to continue this spending spree without significantly higher interest rates and further devaluation of the dollar. This all spells more trouble for our economy and certainly higher inflation. Our industry base is shattered, and our borders remain open to those who exploit our reeling entitlement system.

Economic realities will prevail regardless of the enthusiasm by most Members of Congress for a continued expansion of the welfare state and support for our dangerously aggressive foreign policy. The welfare/warfare state will come to an end when the dollar fails and the wealth simply runs out.

The overriding goal should then be to rescue our constitutional liberties which have been steadily eroded by those who claim that sacrificing liberties is required and legitimate in times of war, even the undeclared and vague war that we are currently fighting.

A real solution to our problems will require a better understanding of and a greater dedication to free markets and private property rights. It can't be done without restoring a sound asset-backed currency. If we hope to restore any measure of constitutional government, we must abandon the policy of policing the world and keeping troops in the four corners of the earth. Our liberties and our prosperity depend on it.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. MCKINNEY (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MCCARTHY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SKELTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RAMSTAD) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, today and September 14.

Mr. NUSSLE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, September 12, 13, 14, and 15.

Mr. GILCHREST, for 5 minutes, September 12, 13, 14, and 15.

Mr. GOHMERT, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, September 8, 2006, at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

9190. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Bifenazate; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2006-0327; FRL-8090-1] received August 25, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9191. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental

Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Ethofumesate; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0537; FRL-8086-2] received August 25, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9192. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — S-metolachlor; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2006-0292; FRL-8090-2] received August 25, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9193. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Azoxystrobin; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0540; FRL-8086-9] received August 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9194. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Dimethenamid; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2006-0165; FRL-8079-3] received August 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9195. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Triflurizole; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [EPA-HQ-OPP-2006-0461; FRL-8078-1] received August 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9196. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Bifenthrin; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2006-0366; FRL-8081-7] received August 9, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9197. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Copper Sulfate Pentahydrate; Tolerance Exemption in or on Various Food and Feed Commodities [EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0314; FRL-8085-3] received August 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9198. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Imidacloprid; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0542; FRL-8081-8] received August 9, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9199. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Lepidopteran Pheromones; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2006-0529; FRL-8083-8] received August 9, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9200. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pesticide Management and Disposal; Standards for Pesticide Containers and Containment [EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0327; FRL-8076-2] (RIN: 2070-AB95) received August 9, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9201. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pesticides; Procedural Regulations for Registration Review [EPA-HQ-

OPP-2004-0404; FRL-8080-4] (RIN: 2070-AD29) received August 9, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9202. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Sanitizers with No Food-Contact Uses in Registered Pesticide Products; Revocation of Tolerance Exemptions [EPA-HQ-OPP-2006-0495; FRL-8086-1] received August 9, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9203. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Inorganic Bromide; Tolerance Actions [EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0123; FRL-8077-6] received August 9, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9204. A letter from the Chief, Programs and Legislation Division, Department of the Air Force, Department of Defense, transmitting Notice of the decision to conduct a standard competition of the 57th Maintenance Groups performed by civilian personnel in the Department of the Air Force, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2461; to the Committee on Armed Services.

9205. A letter from the Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of the enclosed list of officers to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

9206. A letter from the Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report on how information is provided to potential recruits and to new entrants into the Armed Forces on "Stop Loss" authorities and initial periods of military service obligation, pursuant to Section 546 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006; to the Committee on Armed Services.

9207. A letter from the Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of the enclosed list of officers to wear the insignia of the next higher grade in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

9208. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Health Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter in response to Senate Report 109-141 requesting comparison of accession bonuses, salaries and other benefits offered by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

9209. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Mexico pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

9210. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to India pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

9211. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Brazil pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

9212. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Mexico pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the

Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

9213. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Mexico pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

9214. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to India pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

9215. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Tribal Strategy; Solid Waste Disposal Act, Subtitle I, as amended by Title XV, Subtitle B of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 [FRL-8208-4] received August 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9216. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Iowa [EPA-R07-OAR-2006-0484; FRL-8213-9] received August 25, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9217. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Amendments to Regulations for Heavy-Duty Diesel Engines [EPA-HQ-OAR-2005-0474; FRL-8214-9] (RIN: 2060-AN70) received August 25, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9218. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Determination of Attainment; Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Indiana; Redesignation of Allen County 8-hour Ozone Nonattainment Area to Attainment for Ozone [EPA-R05-OAR-2006-0399; FRL-8214-5] received August 25, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9219. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, South Coast Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2006-0225; FRL-8207-9] received August 25, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9220. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Amendments to Existing Regulation Provisions Concerning Maintenance, Non-attainment, and Prevention of Significant Deterioration Areas [EPA-R03-OAR-2005-VA-0010; FRL-8211-2] received August 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9221. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Revised Definition of "Volatile Organic Compound" [EPA-R03-OAR-2006-0153; FRL-8211-1] received August 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9222. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation

of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri [EPA-R07-OAR-2006-046 7; FRL-8209-9] received August 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9223. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Health and Safety Data Reporting; Addition of Certain Chemicals [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2005-0055; FRL-7764-7] (RIN: 2070-AB11) received August 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9224. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Preliminary Assessment Information Reporting; Addition of Certain Chemicals [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2005-0014; FRL-7764-9] (RIN: 2070-AB08) received August 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9225. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Reportable Quantity Adjustments for Carbamates and Carbamate-Related Hazardous Waste Streams; Reportable Quantity Adjustment for Inorganic Chemical Manufacturing Process Waste (K178) [EPA-HQ-SFUND-2002-0010; EPA-HQ-SFUND-2002-0011; FRL-8210-5] (RIN: 2050-AE12) received August 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9226. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of South Dakota; Revisions to the Administrative Rules of South Dakota [EPA-R08-OAR-2006-0604; FRL-8208-8] received August 9, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9227. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Tennessee; Redesignation of the Montgomery County, Tennessee Portion of the Clarksville-Hopkinsville 8-Hour Ozone Non-attainment Area to Attainment; Correcting Amendment [EPA-R04-OAR-2005-TN-0007-200527(c) FRL-8208-9] received August 9, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9228. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b; to the Committee on International Relations.

9229. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting consistent with the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Pub. L. 107-243), the Authorization for the Use of Force Against Iraq Resolution (Pub. L. 102-1), and in order to keep the Congress fully informed, a report prepared by the Department of State for the June 15, 2006 — August 15, 2006 reporting period including matters relating to post-liberation Iraq under Section 7 of the Iraq Liberation Act of 1998 (Pub. L. 105-338); to the Committee on International Relations.

9230. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report for 2005 on the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) Activities in countries described in Section 307 (a) of the Foreign Assistance Act, pursuant to Public Law 105-277, section 2809(c)(2); to the Committee on International Relations.

9231. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification regarding the proposed license for the export of defense equipment to the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (Transmittal No. DDTC 028-06); to the Committee on International Relations.

9232. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

9233. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's FY 2007 Annual Performance Plan; to the Committee on Government Reform.

9234. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

9235. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

9236. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's report for FY 2005 and the preceding four fiscal years on the activities to ensure accountability for antidiscrimination and whistleblower laws related to employment, pursuant to Public Law 107-174, section 203; to the Committee on Government Reform.

9237. A letter from the Chairman, National Endowment for the Arts, transmitting pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Activities Inventory Reform (FAIR) Act of 1998 (Pub. L. 105-270) and OMB Circular A-76, Performance of Commercial Activities, the Endowment's FY 2006 inventory of commercial activities performed by federal employees and inventory of inherently governmental activities; to the Committee on Government Reform.

9238. A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the Inherently Governmental and Commercial Activities Inventory as required by the Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act of 1998 (the FAIR ACT); to the Committee on Government Reform.

9239. A letter from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting the Board's 2006 FAIR ACT inventory; to the Committee on Government Reform.

9240. A letter from the Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting the second annual report of the Administration's use of the category rating system; to the Committee on Government Reform.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida:

H.R. 6039. A bill to expand retroactive eligibility of the Army Combat Action Badge to include members of the Army who participated in combat during which they personally engaged, or were personally engaged by, the enemy at any time on or after December 7, 1941; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CRENSHAW:

H.R. 6040. A bill to establish the Accountable Budgeting Commission; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia:

H.R. 6041. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to make service-disabled veterans

eligible under the 8(a) business development program; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mrs. EMERSON:

H.R. 6042. A bill to amend the Animal Health Protection Act to prohibit the Secretary of Agriculture from implementing or carrying out a National Animal Identification System or similar requirement and to require the Secretary to protect information obtained as part of any voluntary animal identification system; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H.R. 6043. A bill to amend the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act so that it will be interpreted in accordance with the original intent of Congress to require a significant relationship be found between remains discovered on federal lands and presently existing Native American tribes for those remains to be applicable under the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. HINOJOSA:

H.R. 6044. A bill to authorize appropriations for the rural housing and economic development program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. NADLER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 6045. A bill to extend the time for filing certain claims under the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. OWENS, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. WEINER):

H.R. 6046. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for comprehensive health benefits for the relief of individuals whose health was adversely affected by the 9/11 disaster; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ORTIZ:

H.R. 6047. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to waive inadmissibility based on a misrepresentation in the case of an immediate relative of an active duty or reserve member of the Armed Forces and to extend the V nonimmigrant visa program for spouses and children of such a member; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico:

H.R. 6048. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide incentives to Medicare participating suppliers and providers of services that are outpatient physical therapy services (including outpatient speech-language pathology services) and occupational therapy services to report quality and efficiency measures and to provide for a value-based purchasing program for payments for such services under the Medicare Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. FOXX:

H.J. Res. 94. A joint resolution recognizing the contributions of the Christmas tree industry to the United States economy and

urging the Secretary of Agriculture to establish programs to raise awareness of the importance of the Christmas tree industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BERMAN (for himself and Mr. DELAHUNT):

H. Res. 985. A resolution directing the Secretary of State to provide to the House of Representatives certain documents in the possession of the Secretary of State relating to the report submitted to the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives on July 28, 2006, pursuant to the Iran and Syria Nonproliferation Act; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida (for herself, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. WALSH):

H. Res. 986. A resolution recognizing youth court programs for the efforts of such programs in enhancing the quality of the juvenile justice system in the United States and encouraging the recognition of a National Youth Court Month; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H. Res. 987. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 147) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. POE:

H. Res. 988. A resolution honoring the life and accomplishments of Joe Rosenthal; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. POE:

H. Res. 989. A resolution commending the United Kingdom for its efforts in the War on Terror, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Ms. WATERS:

H. Res. 990. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the original authorization for use of force against Iraq contained in Public Law 107-243 is outdated and Congress should vote on a new use of force resolution that reflects the current situation in Iraq; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. WESTMORELAND (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. MARSHALL, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. LINDER, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. BARROW, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SHERWOOD):

H. Res. 991. A resolution congratulating the Columbus Northern Little League Baseball Team from Columbus, Georgia, on its victory in the 2006 Little League World Series Championship games; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. WOLF (for himself, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. TANCREDO):

H. Res. 992. A resolution urging the President to appoint a Presidential Special Envoy for Sudan; to the Committee on International Relations.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 19: Mr. WAMP.
H.R. 23: Mr. SABO, Mr. MOLLOHAN, and Mr. DENT.
H.R. 65: Mr. GOODE.
H.R. 111: Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 294: Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 303: Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 566: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 615: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 752: Ms. WATSON and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 817: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 823: Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 896: Mr. FORTUÑO and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 941: Mr. GERLACH, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. POMBO.

H.R. 1070: Mr. BONNER.

H.R. 1188: Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 1243: Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, and Mr. PITTS.

H.R. 1264: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. WYNN, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 1288: Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 1384: Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GRAVES, and Mr. CARDOZA.

H.R. 1405: Mr. DOYLE and Mr. MURPHY.

H.R. 1634: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky and Mr. GINGREY.

H.R. 2047: Mr. SOUDER and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2088: Mr. GRAVES and Mr. CARDOZA.

H.R. 2343: Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 2421: Mrs. KELLY, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. BAKER, Mr. JINDAL, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. BONNER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. HOLT, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. FERGUSON, Ms. ROYBAL-ALDAR, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. KIRK.

H.R. 2567: Mr. EHLERS and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 2671: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 2679: Mr. HAYES, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, and Ms. HARRIS.

H.R. 2680: Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 2694: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.

H.R. 2717: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 2719: Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2861: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. EHLERS, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 2869: Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 2945: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 3005: Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 3195: Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 3361: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 3436: Mr. PLATTS and Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.

H.R. 3478: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FORTUÑO, and Mr. ALEXANDER.

H.R. 3479: Mr. UDALL of Colorado.

H.R. 3559: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. WICKER.

H.R. 3584: Mr. ANDREWS and Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 3762: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 3850: Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 3931: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 3954: Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 4098: Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 4156: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. BOYD.

H.R. 4222: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 4232: Mr. FARR.

H.R. 4264: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 4277: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 4293: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 4304: Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 4341: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 4347: Mr. BROWN of Ohio and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 4366: Mr. GORDON, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BOYD.

H.R. 4429: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 4491: Mr. FORD and Mr. MURPHY.

H.R. 4547: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Mr. MOLLOHAN.

H.R. 4560: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. GILCHREST, and Mr. LEACH.

H.R. 4597: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 4609: Mr. FORD.

H.R. 4623: Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 4716: Mr. MCCOTTER and Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 4747: Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 4751: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. PLATTS, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. REHBERG.

H.R. 4771: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 4800: Mr. HINCHEY and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 4823: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 4856: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 4925: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 4964: Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 5005: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. GRAVES.

H.R. 5056: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 5072: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 5092: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. MARCHANT, and Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 5099: Mr. EDWARDS.

H.R. 5100: Mr. WALSH, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 5139: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 5148: Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 5150: Mr. WEINER.

H.R. 5161: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 5167: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. LEACH, and Ms. HOOLEY.

H.R. 5173: Mr. REHBERG and Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 5179: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 5182: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. STUPAK, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. RYUN of Kansas.

H.R. 5185: Mr. BARROW and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 5234: Mr. DOYLE and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 5236: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 5249: Mr. HALL, Mr. BARROW, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. MURPHY.

H.R. 5255: Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 5280: Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 5388: Mr. MATHESON.

H.R. 5452: Mr. PEARCE and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H.R. 5460: Mr. RENZI.

H.R. 5465: Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 5478: Mr. GOHMERT and Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 5550: Mr. ABERCROMBIE and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 5555: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 5557: Mr. STARK.

H.R. 5558: Mr. PENCE, Mr. POE, and Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 5562: Mr. MCINTYRE, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 5575: Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 5579: Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 5608: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 5624: Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. NEY, and Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 5630: Mr. UDALL of Colorado.

H.R. 5644: Mr. MCCOTTER and Mr. FORD.

H.R. 5650: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 5671: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 5680: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 5698: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island and Mr. BOSWELL.

H.R. 5704: Mr. GERLACH and Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.

H.R. 5707: Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 5738: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 5743: Mr. RAMSTAD and Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 5746: Ms. LEE, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mr. FARR, Mr. BOUCHER, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, and Mr. SALAZAR.

H.R. 5751: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 5755: Mr. TERRY and Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 5758: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 5769: Mr. CANNON and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 5772: Mr. GALLEGLY and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 5803: Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 5805: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 5806: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 5818: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 5837: Mr. CARNAHAN.

H.R. 5862: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 5866: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. THORNBERRY, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. CARTER, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. HALL, and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 5871: Mr. EHLERS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. FORD, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 5890: Mr. KLINE and Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 5905: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Mr. CASE.

H.R. 5948: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 5977: Ms. HARRIS.

H.R. 5986: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 6033: Mr. GILLMOR.

H. J. Res. 79: Ms. PELOSI.

H. Con. Res. 222: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H. Con. Res. 346: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H. Con. Res. 391: Mr. LEACH.

H. Con. Res. 424: Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. PITTS, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. BERRY.

H. Con. Res. 465: Mr. PAUL, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. FILNER, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. GORDON, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. ROTHMAN.

H. Res. 20: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.

H. Res. 518: Mr. TERRY, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. MORAN of Kansas.

H. Res. 622: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEACH, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H. Res. 745: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina.

H. Res. 874: Mr. FOSSELLA.

H. Res. 938: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. PAYNE, and Ms. DEGETTE.

H. Res. 940: Mr. McNULTY, Mr. BACA, Mr. BECERRA, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. HONDA, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. PENCE, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, and Mr. SWEENEY.

H. Res. 943: Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan.

H. Res. 971: Mr. SHAYS.

H. Res. 973: Mr. POMEROY, Mr. KUHL of New York, and Mr. KIND.

H. Res. 976: Mr. DINGELL and Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H. Res. 983: Mr. DENT.